

WAR OR REVOLUTION

WAR OR REVOLUTION

by

GEORGES VALOIS

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

MUSEUM STREET

Published in France under the title "Guerre ou Révolution" in 1931

FIRST PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH 1932

Translated by E. W. Dicks

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

TO
EDOUARD BERTH
AFFECTIONATELY, HIS FRIEND
G. V.

War is going to become an anachronism.

The reason why we have had fighting throughout the Continent is that two societies have stood face to face—the society which dates from 1789, and its predecessor. It was impossible for the two to subsist alongside one another; the younger has devoured the other. I am well aware that the ultimate issue of the fighting brought my own downfall, and the defeat in me of the representative of the French Revolution and instrument of its principles; but what of that? It was a battle lost for civilization. Take it from me, civilization will have its revenge. There are two systems, the past and the future; the present is no more than a painful transition. Which must triumph? The future, obviously. And that means intelligence, industry, peace, as the past meant brute force, privilege, ignorance. Every one of our victories was a triumph for the ideas of the Revolution. Some day victories will be achieved without guns and bayonets.

NAPOLÉON,
Mémoires de Ste Hélène

CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | II |
| I. HUMANITY'S CHOICE: WAR OR REVOLUTION | 23 |
| II. THE NATURE OF WAR | 36 |
| III. A REVERSAL OF VALUES | 47 |
| IV. HUMANITY VERSUS WAR | 59 |
| V. IDEOLOGIES AND INSTITUTIONS TO BE DESTROYED | 102 |
| VI. THE CULTURE OF THE PRODUCERS | 130 |
| VII. THE TASK OF REVOLUTION | 151 |

PREFACE

Before writing the first page of a work in which I shall advocate the entire condemnation of war, I think it will be useful to give the reader a few indications of my present position and outlook, and of the circumstances which have enabled me to attain the knowledge of certain fragments of truths which, pieced together with those which are the common property of humanity, seem to me to furnish to-day at least one truth intelligible to all.

My claim is that I am performing a scientific task so far as concerns the analysis of human factors, and a constructive one, with a full grasp of realities, when the question is approached of the organization of a world from which war shall be excluded. It is for the reader to see whether my scientific analysis is tainted by any lapse from the dispassionate, and whether my constructive proposals are those of a dreamer or a realist. I ask of him, however, that he shall rid himself of all prejudices, as I am doing myself. Almost all readers are prejudiced against a writer who condemns war—prejudiced against his mentality. They suppose him to be excessively sensitive to the odour of blood, or blinded to realities by his sense of the brotherhood of man, or just day-dreaming.

Thus, I owe the reader some information concerning my own career, in order to save him from any misjudgment before he has read a page of this book. Let me tell him, then, that my character and career, my mentality and my past occupations are the very reverse of those of the pacifist-by-inclination. I belong to the generation which was formed between 1885 and 1900. We were brought up on strong daily doses of the most ardent patriotism. For us war was a necessity for the remedying of the outrage suffered by France and humanity and the Almighty in 1870. I belong to the generation which went over to revolutionism between 1895 and 1905, but remained loyal to the conception which I have just mentioned—so much so that when war came in 1914 they supported it almost unanimously. For all our revolutionism, at the turn of the century we were still entirely militarist at heart. The anti-militarists of the 'nineties were simply militarists of another colour. Their whole conception of revolution was combatant. They were hostile to the army, but in their secret hearts they dimly felt that the fighters were the salt of the earth. To that generation I belonged; I shared its ideas, its feelings, its passions.

More than that: in my effort to comprehend the modern world and the play of eternal forces in this world of to-day, I wrote an apologia of

war. At twenty-seven I published a first book, *L'homme qui Vient*, which contains nothing less than a whole philosophy of war. It also contains, as will be seen later, in five lines one little fundamental truth of which I have never lost sight, and which has enabled me to arrive at my present position. For all that, that work praises war as the founder of cities. It was an error into which men like Proudhon and Anatole France had fallen; I shared it with them.

In 1914 I went to the war, with some millions of our brother-men. I am bound to say that it did not inspire me with the feelings of horror that might have been expected. I have no love for bloodshed; and, volunteer, patriot, and nationalist as I was, I was nevertheless able and took particular care, as a matter of personal taste, during a certain number of days of pretty hot fighting, to avoid shedding the blood of any German. Observe that that did not prevent me from serving in command or sub-command of a little detachment of thirty men who succeeded, in two months of daily encounters, in inflicting on their opponents a loss of the same number in killed, wounded, and prisoners. Our detachment was commanded by a Benedictine monk, Dom David, and myself. We both commanded with the same objective: victory, not slaughter. We ordered the firing; but we had no desire per-

sonally to participate in the slaughter—Dom David, as a Christian; myself, for reasons which I did not analyse. But whatever my reasons, they did not include horror of spilt blood. During the war I saw many horrible sights, and they gave me no feeling of horror. I should like to be able to record that I felt respect for human life and love for the human race, and that I suffered at sight of the suffering of my fellow-men; but that would be going too far. The most that I can say is that in face of death I was very conscious of a revolt of the intelligence. There is nothing very sentimental about that. I found it absurd, revolting, that magnificent intelligences should be reduced to nothingness by a tiny strip of steel from some shell sent over by men themselves possessing intelligence.

I must admit also that I was not particularly moved by the spectacle of burning or devastation. It appeared to me that the result would be the subsequent erection of much more rational and more beautiful cities.

So much may be said to let you see that war, with its ruin and horror, aroused in me no stirring of the heart to put fresh life into my sentimental valuations. I am bound to say that it produced in me an undoubted hardening, and that since 1914 the life of the individual has seemed to me to be a thing of no great value. I

have got into the way of realizing that war and revolution are spendthrift of men, and that the loss in human lives is of little weight in comparison with the historic outcome. After that you will know that, tender-hearted as I may seem to Lucien Romier,¹ I am not in the least sentimental.

Let me add that in the course of my life I have known only one interesting occupation for thirty years past—work; first of necessity, later as a matter of preference, to-day as a passion. You will see later that this fact weighs heavily in the judgments which I shall put before you in regard to war. You must know in this regard that I belong to the type of men called realist, constructive, rationalistic, and so on; the men interested in methods, organization, calculations, statistics, positive results, balance-sheets, plans.

I have thus introduced myself to you in order that you may see that I do not set out to be a mere logic-chopper; that I am immersed in realities; I know them; and, moreover, that I have no resemblance whatever to those whom people call bleaters of peace (which, after all, is better than being yellers of war). I might add, further, that I am one of those who have no belief at all in the possibility of producing peace by means of gentlemen's agreements—but of

¹ Editor of the *Journée Industrielle*.—TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

that more later. You know the essence of what I wanted to make clear—that I am very far from being, by temperament, by situation, by constitution or by function, one of those soft people who hate war because it is cruel.

* * *

If I introduce any sentiment into my judgments of war, it is this—I hate war because it is stupid, prodigiously stupid, the essence of stupidity. I hate it because I have come to understand, to realize, that it is the act through which humanity retains its animalism. War is the act of the brute beast.

It took me half-a-century of life and thirty years of methodical thinking to make this discovery, of which I shall presently give you the rational bases, some of them never before stated. There is nothing to be wondered at in this. It took poor humanity centuries, tens of centuries. And I have passed from one conclusion to another just as humanity has done. Do not tell me that I should have been guided by the sentiment of human brotherhood: I shall reply that many enemies of war and doctrinaires of brotherhood are still, in my eyes, very much of bellicists. Many of them want to make war on war by means of special armies—Red armies in par-

ticular, as do the citizens of Soviet Russia. I have become an opponent of all militarisms, including that of the anti-militarists, Soviet or other. I regard it as a grave error to make war on militarisms by military means. Dynastic war, imperialistic war, revolutionary war—to me they are all just war; in other words, the act of the brute beast.

I have, in short, emerged from that synthesis of valuations inherited from past ages under which war, curse though it be, is regarded as a consecrated evil, an expiation, a mystery which man must not hope to comprehend.

It is to war itself, to personal experience of war, that I owe this glimpse of a truth already familiar, already proclaimed, but rarely explained. I have lived, like millions of men, in intimate touch with war, for months on months. I have seen it in all its aspects. Then it was that it lost for me that aureole of a consecrated horror which kept its true face hidden from us. Its mystery? Its prestige? Its consecrated character? Of all that there is nothing left in my mind.

War, as we have at last been able to see it, is nothing else but an explosion of animal frenzy, making use, through an artifice of which I shall speak later, of the creative intelligence of man. It is, moreover, in violent contradiction with

everything that goes to make up the worth of the modern world; and, to crown all, it is the event most surely calculated to ruin the virtues which are necessary to the progress of man.

Some people will tell me that other writers, men who have seen war and fought in it, present the very opposite verdict on war. One of these is René Quinton, the biologist, a great intellectual, and a great gunner from 1914 to 1918. You will read my reflections on that point later. Here I will only briefly indicate them. Quinton, in his *Maximes* on war, has judged war through the feelings which exalted him during the actual fighting. He saw the finest virtues in practice. But the virtues that he saw were his own. He saw how war made renunciation easy, made abnegation, sacrifice, nobility of soul easy, for men like himself. Nothing could be truer. But the fact that René Quinton is a great patriot, sacrificing himself entirely during the war to the conception of the *patrie* which he bore within himself, makes no difference at all to the nature of the phenomenon of war; just as, for all that Joan of Arc was a saint, living as a saint in the midst of war, her saintliness was in no way due to war, and her soldiers were merely toughened rascals like the rest.

I speak only of Quinton, the one intellectual of our day who, having served at the front, and

magnificently, has praises left for war. I will say nothing of the others, all those Paul Bourgets and publicists who turn up their eyes at the "grandeur of war" and the "heroism of our soldiers." These gentry, safely ensconced in their studies, ply a very dirty trade, investing skill in murdering with the laurels of heroism in order to send countless young men to their death—and then selling the story of their sufferings at a few francs a volume, to the great satisfaction of munition firms and, in general, of those who live far from the fighting.

René Quinton had nothing in common with that vile crowd, the dregs of a period of history which is approaching its end. If he furnishes them with arguments, it is for quite different reasons to the base reasons of the war profiteer. In face of the war this great scientist fell into a grave error: instead of applying his own scientific method in order to ascertain the true facts concerning what was happening, he translated into scientific language the emotions which he felt amid the events which he was witnessing. That is why he is one of the few men fitted to see the world clearly who have not drawn from the world war a conclusion against all war.

Almost all the rest, and among them a considerable number of ex-combatants, to-day condemn war. Not because they are afraid of it—

they have given proof thousands of times over of their contempt of suffering and death—but because they adjudge it to be stupid, absurd, useless, spendthrift, destructive, and absolutely against the interest of nations and of humanity. If they still remain hesitant in their judgment of war and of the institutions founded for war, it is not because they are hesitant in their condemnation but because they are not yet quite sure on what grounds to attack them, or how war can be eliminated, or how a world in which war is excluded could be organized.

I propose to give here a thoroughly documented condemnation of war, scientifically prepared, to say how it is possible to proceed to the elimination of war, and to show the institutions which must be provided for a world in which war is regarded as a crime.

I indicate here at the outset what my thesis will be: humanity is living to-day under a set of institutions which are based on war and which call forth war; it will only escape from war, which would be the ruin of all its positive achievements, if it proceeds to the demolition of these institutions.

In other words, humanity will only escape from war through revolution. Not through a revolution of rioters, but through a revolution of constructors, engineers, producers. Which brings

PREFACE

21

me to my message to each one of my readers : If
you want peace, prepare for revolution.

MEDITERRANEAN

ON BOARD THE "CHAMBORD"

January 25, 1931

WAR OR REVOLUTION

CHAPTER I

HUMANITY'S CHOICE: WAR OR REVOLUTION

I

Humanity stands between war and revolution. It has not acquired its position by thinking; it is its position that is engendering thought. Its thought is a stocktaking. In other words, if a nation tries to avoid war it finds that it cannot do so by any policy of armaments, and that it is obliged to abandon the war system, but that it enters then into a revolutionary system; while, if it resigns itself to the policy of armaments which leads to war, it is virtually sure not merely to enter but to be precipitated into a revolutionary situation.

The belief is held by intelligent people that this general situation arises from ill-will in one quarter or another, and in particular from that of the Communists, who are accused of arousing all humanity against the right of the sword. Intelligent people are aware that the situation is governed by an historic movement, proceeding

from the human intelligence but beyond the control of ideas. The movement has undeniably gained pace since the Russian revolution, but it dates from long before it. It dates from the moment when man invented tools. Its rapid acceleration begins, however, with Denis Papin and his discovery of the power of steam.

The well-informed statesman is aware of this fact, even if he has no explanation for it. And that is why he knows that within the political and social framework of our day the industrial movement creates enormous international oppositions, which carry the nations along both towards war and towards revolution. The most intelligent among the politicians and thinkers of neo-capitalism consider even that it has become indispensable to pass from national to continental formations, and that without delay, both to prevent war and to prevent revolution.

A widespread public feeling is forming against war, which is regarded as the worst of disasters. The belligerents of 1914-1918 have had no difficulty in calculating that the Great War was ruinous alike for vanquished and victors. It is the general view that the war ended in the defeat of Europe, intellectually, economically, and politically.

For the first time it is becoming perfectly plain to the ex-belligerents that war is bad

business and cannot pay. The explanation is not yet offered, but the fact is realized. Before the war, Europe enjoyed the incontestable leadership of humanity, ruling the whole world by its intelligence, its strength, or its money; since the war its domain has shrunk enormously. Intellectually, it has been eliminated throughout the whole extent of the U.S.S.R., and its culture is disputed in the territories of the U.S.A.; economically and financially, it is reduced to its own territory with Africa and fragments of Asia; the European possessions in Asia are in a very precarious condition to-day. Finally, the Europe of the ex-belligerents, vanquished and victors, is obliged every year to make remittances to the United States in amortization of its debt, under such conditions that it seems to be paying tribute to America. European imperialism, in all its forms, was completely beaten in the course of the Great War. Ten years after the peace, the two great social groups which are progressing seem to be those which placed war on an inferior footing—America, who did not engage her whole resources in the war and who took over its financial direction, and the Soviet Union, which brusquely withdrew from it, disowning victory and defeat.

Europe is discovering with surprise that it is possible for a nation to place itself above or out-

side the war systems. It feels that a new war on its territory would be equivalent this time to suicide, and that, moreover, war might perhaps begin between nations or states, but would continue as a class war.

Such are the considerations which are filling the thoughts of an increasing number of Europeans. It is true that there has been, on the other hand, a reinforcement of the war system through the various forms of Fascism which have taken shape in Italy, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and even, in a lesser degree, in Germany and France. But the faith in war is declining at a surprising pace. The profession of arms is no longer regarded as superior to others. It may even be said that in the hierarchy of human occupations it has fallen very distinctly below the rest. This is true, above all, in France and Germany. The old militarism is markedly in decline.

It is true, nevertheless, that peoples and their states remain very hesitant in face of the problem of war and peace. The majority is certainly enormous of those who have no desire for war in Europe, but it is a majority that does not pronounce unhesitatingly against war. It is composed of people who think that war is a phenomenon which ought to disappear, but they are more certain that it should than that

it will. They allow themselves to be affected by the clamour of the bellicists who attribute the post-war difficulties of the so-called victor nations to the whittling-down of the fruits of victory. Finally, they are unable to imagine a social system with the soldier no longer in his premier place. In short, in a world in which great masses of humanity want no more war, and in which the whole course of progress tends to eliminate war, the risks of war remain considerable, and preparation for war is intense, because peoples and states do not know how to emerge from the general political system in which war is included and the function of the warrior is regarded as a normal one.

When one seeks the reason for this contradiction, one discovers that even the most clear-sighted sections of humanity have as yet no decided answer to give to the question whether war is an inescapable evil from which one must seek protection as best one may, but which one cannot remove, or a human phenomenon which can and should disappear.

II

To-day there is scarcely to be found any declared bellicist. Most of the defenders of war are too discreet to offer any open apologia; they give

out that their advocacy of preparedness for war is merely the expression of their desire for peace. The avowed believer in the excellence of war as a means of natural selection among races and peoples has disappeared. His counterpart of to-day says instead that war is an impenetrable phenomenon, rooted in the depths of human nature and destined to endure as long as human society. He tries to take the subject out of the field of scientific analysis and practical knowledge, and to keep it in the region of human mysteries, where it is safely beyond the reach of the intelligent investigator. This is the invariable practice of European Fascism, the modern representative of bellicism; it gives no other explanation of war than that it is one of the mysteries of human life. The nationalist with claims beyond the frontier says, for his part, that a phenomenon observed since the earliest origins of human society is a phenomenon consubstantial with human life, which accordingly will endure as long as man himself endures.

The bellicists have long employed the biological argument of selection through war. Since, however, all Europe discovered from bitter experience that this selection works the wrong way, the argument has been dropped. The bellicists prefer the argument of the mystery of war. We remain virtually at the point to

which Maistre and Proudhon brought us. "War," said Maistre, "is divine in itself, since it is a law of the world. War is divine in the mysterious glory which surrounds it and in the no less inexplicable attraction which carries us towards it. War is divine in the manner of its declaration. How many of those who are regarded as the authors of a war were dragged into it by circumstances! War is divine through its results, which escape from human speculation."

Proudhon praised Maistre, saying that in his avowal of his inability to comprehend war he showed "that he comprehended something of it." "War," wrote Proudhon, "is, I am not afraid to say, eternal. Praised be war! It is by war that man, almost as soon as he emerges from the mud which served him for matrix, erects himself majestic and valiant; it is above the body of a beaten enemy that he dreams his first dream of glory and immortality. . . ." "There is no people which does not, once it has gained some renown in the world, glory above all in its military annals; these are its fairest titles to the esteem of posterity. Are you going to make of them marks of infamy? Philanthropist, you talk of abolishing war; beware lest you degrade the human race."

That case has never been more strongly put.

Yet, after this apologia for war, Proudhon arrived at the conclusion that war would be suppressed by the will of humanity, which, he said, wants no more war. He had brought forward a thousand brave arguments in favour of the bellicists which they would have been incapable of discovering for themselves; but at the end of his *La Guerre et la Paix* he put the statement, buttressed by no argument, that man wants an end of war.

Thus, alike on the right, with Maistre, and the left, with Proudhon, there is a whole stream of pro-war ideology, centring constructive political thought on the war system. And although the peoples, who are the raw material of battles, are more and more against war, the governments, while giving more and more lip service to this growing anti-war feeling, are unceasingly applying their ingenuity to the preparation for war by some other name: both governments of the Right and governments of the Left. Socialism itself, for all its anti-bellicism when it is very close to the proletarian movement, finds itself compelled, when it approaches the governmental stage, to become almost as militarist as the parties of law and order; that is, of all the old forms of the state with military basis.

The Communists are fond of twitting the Socialists with their participation in national

defence: in other words, in the preparation for war; those Socialists who, by participating in government through their support of a government of the Left, directly or indirectly lend their assistance to the organization of the army, the Communists call "Social Traitors"; but the Communists themselves have not cleared their minds of military conceptions; they substitute the idea of the war of classes for that of war between states or nations. Almost everywhere the revolutionary conception remains a warlike one. Thus, while the growth of anti-war feeling is really enormous, popular thought remains inert in face of the problems implicit in the suppression of war, and the majority of the leaders, even the revolutionary ones, are unable to get away from the conception of the state based on the necessity or the prevision of war.

It is a very curious fact, moreover, that all over Europe the masses of the people, though profoundly pacifist, fail to form any anti-militarist or simply and specifically pacifist majority. The pacifists are regarded with much sympathy; but their general doctrine, their advocacy of international concord and disarmament, does not inspire confidence in those to whom it most appeals. The citizens of the various states have no faith in international concord or in simultaneous disarmament.

When one tries to analyse this paradoxical situation, one finds that the majority of men, in trying to envisage a world in which war is excluded, have the feeling that such a world can only be born through a revolution which would play havoc with all those notions of the state, of social life, and of culture which have hitherto been regarded as fundamental. Thus, between the hated and detested devil of war and the uncharted seas of revolution, they prefer to remain on familiar soil. Yet they discern that they are no longer masters of events, and that they will be compelled one day, probably at no distant date, to choose between war, which would be the suicide of the old civilization, and revolution, which would give birth to a new civilization no longer pivoted on the army—a civilization scarcely conceivable to a man of our time.

III

It is this contradiction—hatred of war, but fear of the event which would suppress it—that produces the profoundly unsettled state of opinion to-day. It is not to be got rid of by a gush of sentiment or by a simple effort of will. It is perfectly true that the operation which will eliminate war will be a revolution; and a revolution which will create a state of society enor-

mously different from that which has been familiar to us from the most distant past. But it must not be supposed that this revolution will take shape of its own accord as a result of our feelings and ideas; it will proceed only from our study of the causes which are engendering it, the conditions in which it will become possible of realization, and the institutions by means of which we shall shape it and endow it with life and permanence.

At this day we are all perfectly well aware that technical progress has created such powers of destruction that, if a new war were to come, we should be running the risk in it of a sort of suicide of the nations involved. We tend to infer that the certainty of disaster will of itself suffice to ward off the event, that peoples and statesmen will avoid war for the simple reason that it would be too appallingly destructive. But the course of history is not changed by horror of what is coming. It is a mistake to suppose that the historic process is necessarily progressive for all peoples at all times; and it is from that mistake that the idea proceeds that the revolution which will eliminate war is necessary and inevitable, and that we may, therefore, shift the burden of its achievement on to the shoulders of the Fates who determine the course of history. That is where we go wrong. It may be, it even

seems certain, that for humanity in the lump and time in the absolute there is an historic inevitability which leads man onwards to a higher state of society, But among the various societies, peoples, nations, empires, federations, during the succeeding periods and epochs and even ages, there are both forward and retrograde movements.

It does not follow because an event is necessary, or called for by another event, that it will come to pass. Socially constructive events only happen by becoming part of the *thought* of the societies concerned. Marx has shown that changes in the method of production produce juridical revolutions; this law of historic materialism, the existence of which no longer seems contestable, requires a complement—that the political, juridical, social revolution rendered necessary by the change in the method of production only succeeds if the society concerned is capable of *thinking it out*, that is, of imagining its forms, of defining and codifying new juridical relations between men, of constructing new institutions. Otherwise the historic process will continue but will lead to an explosion, and the progress achieved will be lost because men have failed to discover the juridical and social forms under which it could have continued.

Thus the immense technical progress which makes war suicidal, if it does not end in a con-

structive revolution, may perfectly well end in a war, in which its destructive capacity would dislocate the states and their destruction would dislocate the institutions which permit the development of scientific and technical progress. There would follow a regression of human societies and the end of the conditions which to-day call for the general revolution which should eliminate war.

In other words, if the general destiny of humanity is fixed, man and society are not without a certain liberty to determine their own destinies, as more or less active agents of the general destiny. It is true that it may be said that the historic force acting at any given moment compels men to find the solution of the enigma which faces them. But I do not want to open up that issue here. I confine myself to pointing out that the revolutions called forth by a given situation can only succeed if they are *thought out* by the men who are plunged into the events which are making them necessary. History puts before man the successive enigmas of life, and addresses him in the words of the Sphinx: "Solve, or be devoured."

Those same words are being addressed to us to-day. We have to solve the enigma of the revolution demanded by the moment of history in which we are living; if we fail, we shall be devoured by war.

THE NATURE OF WAR

If one analyses the juridical structure of human societies, if one delves to the very foundation, one discovers that every institution without exception is based, in the last resort, on war. So true is this that the most determined adversaries of war, finding it at the base of every civil community, have been led to find a justification for it, at least in the past. Proudhon did so, and later, with a very different approach, Anatole France. For all that they declared that war must disappear, that, in Proudhon's words, "heroism must give place to industry," these writers grant that war had in the past the characters of nobility and manly activity.

I shall not lift my hands in astonishment, having myself, at twenty-seven years of age, fallen into the same error, or, more precisely, having made an incomplete analysis which for fifteen years led me into a series of errors. Like Proudhon and Anatole France, I regarded war as the mother of cities, and the function of the warrior as the most noble of all functions; but unlike these masters, whose policy was contrary to the upshot of their analyses, I sought for the

practical applications of a policy drawn from this historic judgment. It did not seem to me to be rational to publish apologies of war as the creator of cities and at the same time to hold that the general establishment of peace is necessary and destined because justice is necessary, or for that other reason, that fraternity will remove all causes of conflict. If war is the mother of cities and the benefactress of humanity, it is irrational to seek to eliminate it, since man has undergone no change of nature and must remain in the conditions of his origins. 'However, being aware, like Proudhon and France, of the profound movement in humanity towards peace, I thought that war would kill war, and that the day would come when a European Peace, successor of the Pax Romana, would impose universal peace on humanity. But—a peace founded on the war system, that is, on force. For, in the last resort, the problem of war, of the war system, is nothing else than the problem of force, that is, of man's employment of his force to constrain his fellow-man, under threat of death, to submit to a domination, to sacrifice a part of his goods without compensation, to perform acts other than those dictated by self-interest.

The fact that force, war, is found at the base of all human institutions has always brought the

analytic power of the human intelligence to a full stop in face of the phenomenon of war. Or, rather, the analysis of the phenomenon that has been made a hundred times over has always been falsified by a consideration tacitly accepted concerning the origins and the destiny of war. There has never emerged an analysis of war classing warfare among the human acts which are absolutely contrary to the interest of humanity. This is so because it is considered that history cannot have been misguided in leading humanity towards its destinies through incessant wars.

I do not want to describe or criticize the explanations of war which have been put forward by various writers, pacifist or bellicist. I will assume that the reader is familiar with them, and shall confine myself to pointing out that in general war itself has not been scientifically analysed; that it has been regarded as an impenetrable, inexplicable phenomenon; that the attempt has never been made to *comprehend* its actual nature, but only to *place* it in relation to other human factors, from the aspect of human or divine utility. I propose here to proceed to a strictly scientific analysis of the phenomenon of war, apart from all metaphysical considerations of man's origin or end.

If we ask "What is war?" we shall be led to put to ourselves the question, "What is human activity?" We can only consider war as a particular form of human activity. The first question which arises is whether this activity has an object proper to man or outside his person, his needs, and his passions.

All observations of historic times show that by the act of war man has always sought to acquire food, shelter, wives, slaves or animals; that is, the result of production, a means of preserving his life, or a living force capable of production.

Under various forms, modern wars have an object not essentially different. These are the essential facts that one finds in all wars, whatever may have been the pretexts put forward by peoples or states for their warlike enterprises. We may therefore say:

- (1) That war has an object proper to man;
- (2) That this object is the same as that of every human activity, the acquisition of the means by which man maintains, increases, reproduces his life, and augments his protection against all the natural agencies which imperil his existence.

In other words, war is a natural act of man's vital energy, through which he takes by force from his fellow-man food, shelter, wives, and

animals in the other's possession, or even the other's own existence.

* * *

If that was all that we found, we should be able to draw no other conclusion than this: that, since war is a natural act inscribed in human nature, there are strong presumptions for its endurance as long as man himself endures. It would be a discouraging conclusion for sensitive souls; but it would be a logical conclusion from scientific premises. However, we are only at the outset of our analysis. The result at which we arrived leads us on to another. We found that war is an act through which man takes from his fellow-man something belonging to him—

Either his own existence, killing him gratuitously or in order to eat him;

Or the animals which he has accumulated;

Or the produce of the soil which he has gathered for his use.

How can we define an act which aims at taking from a man his life, or the product of his activity in his endeavour to maintain his life? We can only define it as *parasitism*. Thus, war appears to us as an act of parasitism accomplished by the use of force.

It is at this stage that controversy may begin. For instance, the partisans of war may say that

war dates from before man's accumulation of animals or of the produce of the soil, and that it is by war itself that man was led, under the constraint of his fellow-man, to collect herds and to gather and store the fruits of the soil. Such is the argument of Proudhon and of Anatole France, who are not partisans of war, but who believed that the employment of force was the act through which man entered into civilization. It was also my own argument, put forward in *L'homme qui Vient*, a work in which I put an allegorical frontispiece with the sub-title "The man with the whip, or the first noble, or the first capitalist, or the initiator of civilization," and showing the man armed with the whip forcing his fellow-men to work and so to emerge from the state of the animals.

That is a possible subject of controversy. Is it war that makes man engage in work? Or is it work and its results that give the idle the taste for war? The point can be debated, and we will return to it shortly. But discussion as to the first form of war is impossible: it was certainly an act of parasitism. When a man kills his neighbour in order to eat him, that act of war is an act of parasitism.

There remains the second form: Is war an act through which man takes from his fellow-man the product of his labour? Or is it an act through

which he subjects him to a discipline, forcing his fellow-man himself to renounce war and to work? And if this latter, would war be a creative act, the act which would be the origin of labour, the beginning of economic creation?

Observations made in primitive societies, like those made of the various forms of living beings, show that labour proceeds not from violence, from force applied through war, but from the fever of love and of maternity. The act of economic creation—the act by which a man produces or amasses more than is needed for his own immediate satisfaction—appears at the moment when his woman, in the fever of maternity, seeks food and shelter for the being which has emerged from her womb, and when the man, still in the fever of love, takes part in this search for food and protection in order to win the woman, who thenceforth devotes herself to the life which has proceeded from herself.

It must be noted that the struggle of the males for the possession of the female is not an act of war; it is only a struggle of elimination which does not end in death except by accident. In the life of sentient beings this struggle appears above all as a sort of rapid test by means of which the superior right of the healthiest and most energetic males to love is affirmed. The test is virtually decisive as soon as the greater vital

energy of a male is incontestably demonstrated. At that moment the weaker or temporarily less energetic or less frenzied male gives up the struggle.

Observation shows that it is clearly love (and especially the fever of love) that provokes the act of economic creation. Love, the creator of life, is also the creator of the protections of life, the food and shelter, that man is able to produce by work, by the inventiveness of his intelligence, and by the labour of his hands.

War, the destroyer of life, is also the destroyer of work. It is not war that leads man to work. On the contrary, it is war that deters him from working, by the discouragement which it inflicts on him through its capacity for rape and destruction. It is thus in every regard a parasitic act; all the forms which it has taken throughout history are merely transformations of the direct parasitism of its origin in the act of anthropophagy.

* * *

It matters little if this analysis hurts the feelings of those for whom war is man's most noble act. What matters is whether the analysis is well-founded or not. We have arrived at our result by means of social observation. But we shall arrive at the same result by the analytic method

of biological mechanics, which will confirm our first conclusions. What does it show us?

(1) That man is a being ripened by a cellular energy which, like all energy, follows the path of the least resistance, and which, passing through a sensory system, a nervous system, and a muscular system, will always express itself through the search for the minimum effort;

(2) That man, feeling fatigue in his muscles, will demand of his intelligence the discovery of the path of the least effort, and of his imagination the invention of movements and then of tools to diminish his effort;

(3) That it is to this intellectualization of effort, resulting from the appeal from the fatigued muscle to the intelligence, mother of technique, and to the imagination, mother of invention, that *labour* is due—labour, the act of creation through which the protections of human life are increased.

And if we ask ourselves how it is that humanity, with its interest so obviously bound up with labour, has chosen or endured war; how it is that during a very long succession of ages it has honoured war more than work, we shall find as we pursue our analysis that humanity has been divided in accordance with the two tendencies which are at the bottom of human nature—the tendency towards work and the tendency towards war.

That, in accordance with the law of the least effort, man is actually carried both towards work and towards war; for if the fatigued muscle summons his intelligence to economic creation, to diminish his physical effort, the tendency towards the minimum effort, acting also in the domain of intellectual energy, will show him two ways of escaping from muscular fatigue—work and war, which is the rape of the work of another. The individual with a torpid intelligence will find it less fatiguing to seize the results of another's work than to work himself.

Thus, there are two paths of human activity—creative activity through work, and parasitic activity through war. Humanity has always been divided between these two tendencies; and not merely humanity but each individual man is torn between the two tendencies, sometimes parasitic, sometimes creative. Particularly, however, humanity; for through all the ages the two tendencies, the two contradictory expressions of the law of the least effort, have only co-existed in the measure in which warlike minorities have found the minimum of risk and the maximum of enjoyment in the domination of majorities of disarmed producers, compelling them to submit to a levy on the product of their labour.

Through force, through a thousand cunning artifices, through the services of intelligences in

their pay, through a culture developed for the exaltation of the skill of the fighting-man, these minorities have been able to reign and to find apologists for their reign. They remain, none the less, the outcome of the parasitic tendency in human nature. They have succeeded in acquiring immense prestige, of such a nature and such influence that to this day people are scandalized when its true nature is exposed. It remains true, for all that, that they are parasitic minorities, and, far from being agents of human progress, have been a brake on progress throughout all history.

Our analysis shows, then, that war is essentially a parasitic human act. That explains why history is simply the record of the struggle of majorities of disarmed producers against armed warlike minorities. We have now arrived at a moment in history when, through a sudden reversal of the position of the opposing forces, these minorities are about to be condemned to disappear. The tragedy of our time is the effort of these minorities to engineer a warlike explosion before they sink for ever into the night, amid the anathemas of a humanity at last rid of them.

A REVERSAL OF VALUES

We are living in an age which has produced the most prodigious reversal of values that the world has known. For ages the warlike minorities have succeeded in maintaining their domination. Originally formed from among the elements best equipped for brutality, pillage, violation, murder, they have gradually, under the pressure actually of the majorities of disarmed producers, acquired the semblance of civilized men.

These minorities of pillagers, of very limited intelligence, of whom the companions of Clovis and the Cossacks under Mazeppa are very representative examples, were absolutely incapable of investing the states which they built up with an intellectual content. But they always found instruments among the servile or grasping—through terrorism or corruption—traders to do their business, lawyers and intellectuals to build up for them a code and a culture. Thus a complete cultural, juridical, and financial system was devised which established all the valuations required for the maintenance of the warrior in the foremost rank of human societies, for making him the keystone of the constitution and the one

legitimate beneficiary of the levy made on the producer, who was regarded as essentially a beast of burden.

The majorities of producers unceasingly worked for the elimination of these parasitic minorities. Up to now they have always failed. They have succeeded in gaining recognition of their humanity and of a certain number of rights; but on the essential point of human freedoms they have failed. The warlike minorities have changed in name and aspect, but they have remained, and maintain the war system which gives them dominance over a society in which the producer, nevertheless, plays to-day the really leading part.

The majorities of producers have always joined in the movements for liberation initiated by religious prophets, insurgents, and rebels of every sort. They have seen the burden of the parasitic levy on their production lightened. But they have not been able to seize hold of the power which weighs on them. Each time that they have been on the point of succeeding in a general movement, the warlike minorities have been astute enough to incorporate in their ranks as their servants a certain number of demagogues or popular leaders, people who were ready to regard the revolution as achieved from the moment when they themselves began to

benefit from the material advantages reserved for the parasitic minorities.

The first great attempt in modern times, the French Revolution, was at once a great success and a great failure. For the first time the working people threw off at a stroke the minority, of warrior ancestry, who had ruled over them. After that revolution, however, the men of the Revolution, with Napoleon at their head, reconstituted a warrior minority, a military aristocracy as strong as and even stronger than its predecessor.

It is difficult to understand Napoleon's error, for of all the men of action of the Revolution Napoleon was the one who most clearly saw the law of the new world, as is clear from several passages in his *Mémorial*, and in particular in the passage which I reproduce here:

"War is going to become an anachronism.

"The reason why we have had fighting throughout the Continent is that two societies have stood face to face—the society which dates from 1789, and its predecessor. It was impossible for the two to subsist alongside one another; the younger has devoured the other. I am well aware that the ultimate issue of the fighting brought my own downfall, and the defeat in me of the representative of the French Revolution and instrument of its principles; but what

of that? It was a battle lost for civilization. Take it from me, civilization will have its revenge. There are two systems, the past and the future; the present is no more than a painful transition. Which must triumph? The future, obviously. And that means *intelligence, industry, peace*, as the past meant *brute force, privilege, ignorance*. Every one of our victories was a triumph for the ideas of the Revolution. Some day victories will be achieved without guns and bayonets."

It is clear that the man who made that astonishing pronouncement, far above the heads of his contemporaries, had a singularly penetrating vision of the future. Yet it was this man that reconstituted on the ruins of the former regime a new society with the same military basis, reinvigorating the old culture with its valuations based on the exaltation of the warrior.

Napoleon, like the rest of the men of the Revolution, did not attack war at its roots. The fundamental error of the Revolution was that it used military means to combat the militarist majorities who upheld the former regime throughout Europe. The revolutionary war remained still just war, and to man its forces it was obliged to organize a warrior state and to leave it in the hands of a minority which drew the profits of domination. Hence the paradox of the democratic state which proceeded from a

deep popular movement directed against the warrior aristocracies, and yet provoked in Europe the greatest wars which the world had known.

It is true that at bottom these great wars are simply different episodes of the war between the old regime and the new. The war of 1914-1918 was still the war of the popular against the aristocratic estate, and it was only in 1918 that the thrones representing the old military dominations were thrown down for good and all. And under the cover of even this war the warlike minorities are endeavouring to line up again in a fresh advance for the recovery of their control of the state. That is the explanation of European Fascism. On the other hand, the movement against war has gained fresh strength, and will develop into a deliberate attack—not against the warlike minority in possession of this state or that, but against the whole institution of war.

It is from industry that there has emerged the movement which is producing in the very womb of war the forces which will destroy war. War cannot be eliminated from the world either by the ideas or the forces of war. There must be a coalition of forces against it, but of forces of a different nature to its own.

The course of development has been as follows: Up to the present the war system has had in its favour a collection of forces in the hands of

minorities which drew advantages from it. And a necessary psychological condition of the endurance of the system was that it should be profitable to these minorities. The system carried with it the voluntary risk by its beneficiaries of their lives, and it was necessary that there should be abundant compensation for them in the form of money and honours and power. The wars of the French Revolution and of the Empire meant the risk of death in half a hundred battles, but for all the armies engaged it meant twenty-three years of pillage all over Europe, and for the Generals and Marshals lavishly showered honours, duchies, principalities, great fortunes, and a brilliance of prestige which dazzled a whole age. The war of 1870 brought the pillage of France by the German army; the colonial wars meant the pillage of Africa and Asia by European troops. In every case the pillage benefited minorities who drew from it power and enormous wealth, and who allowed a share in the pillage to soldiers withdrawn from production and from the ties of civil society, men with the taste for adventure and a lazy life, pillage, and rape—all things with a strong attraction for the old instincts of man.

Towards the end, however, of the nineteenth century there came a development which prepared the way for a reversal of these conditions.

Scientific and economic progress compelled governments to extend their military material, and warfare carried on by specialized minorities became an impossibility. It became necessary to incorporate the mass of the people in the army, to mobilize the whole nation. And it was impossible to give these enormous masses of soldiery, in compensation for the risk of death imposed on them, the advantages which had formerly been granted to the small professional armies and their leaders. Moreover, with the enormous growth in the material required in modern war it became necessary to give more to military contractors than to the army itself. Formerly the profits of war had gone to those who went out to war; now they go to those who stay behind. Formerly the minorities who profited had the force in their hands, and could employ it against the industrious majority; now the minorities who profit are outside the army, and it is the majorities who do not profit from war, who have been torn from production or drafted into the manufacture of arms and munitions, that have the force in their hands—and have no interest whatever in using it for war.

Thus, war is becoming an absurdity for those who are actually engaged in it, to whichever side they belong. Moreover, victory can only pass in the end to the side which is able to apply

the most immense quantities of material to warfare, that is, the side most capable of invention and production. Finally, the cost of material is so great, the sums eaten up by war are so enormous, that the profits of victory cannot possibly compensate for the cost of the fighting.

War has become an absurdity for the combatants, who can no longer be rewarded in proportion to their risks and sufferings, for the fighter by inclination, who is losing caste in comparison with the worker by inclination, and for the state, which it ruins. It remains rational only for those who have been called war profiteers. These latter have power in time of peace, but in any future war, after the experience of 1914-1918, they would be a tiny minority depending on the protection of police and gendarmerie and face to face with the immense and almost unanimously hostile mass of mobilized citizens, who would have in their hands the whole of the material of war.

* * *

If war has thus become an absurdity for those who may be called on to fight, if it can no longer provide them with food or with the powerful excitement which until not long ago was the dynamic of armies, if it can no longer leave in the hands of the minorities who benefit

from it the collection of forces which was their instrument of domination, if it has reached the point at which it entirely defeats itself, it is not in the least because of the psychological changes which I have been describing. It is because of a development which has taken place in the field of knowledge and of production, and is destined to change the basis of human societies, a development which is itself the cause of the reversal of values now in progress, through which humanity will enter a new era. It is the development foreseen by Napoleon, but as yet scarcely explained: the development which has brought us to this position, that science and invention and industry have made it possible to create an hundred, a thousand, ten thousand times more force than the greatest captain can assemble or dominate by the military art. The explanation of this tremendous fact is as follows:

Until about 1789 men sought the means of production, or of the organization of production for profit, in the harnessing of the energy *of animate beings*, that is, of animals or fellow-men. The main source of production was the muscular energy of slaves, serfs, wage workers, and animals. War was the means by which men skilled in the art of killing subjugated workers and made them work for their profit, with the assistance of administrators capable of controlling the machinery of

a simple economic system. The state was simply the expression of the prestige and accepted legal status of this parasitic operation. War was entirely justified by its results. It was the means by which the masters, specialized in the trade of arms, increased the quantity of human or animal energy in their service, and the territories in which they could employ that energy.

But there emerged from the "steam digester" of Denis Papin the force which is implacably driving that economic system into the shadows of the past. Science and the labours of physicists, chemists, engineers, and electrical inventors, have provided humanity with the means of capturing for production from inanimate nature quantities of energy enormously greater than human or animal power could furnish. The great assembler of productive forces is now no longer the warrior, the man capable of killing or subjugating his fellow-man, but the scientist, the engineer, the constructor. The great conqueror, able to assemble under his command a hundred million men, after killing countless millions and letting loose cholera and plague, has become not only odious but insignificant beside the engineer who, with a few hundred producers, captures and utilizes hundreds of millions of horse-power drawn from the bowels of the earth or from streams or torrents.

The same development has made war no longer the means of the acquisition of added power for a class or a people; war has become merely a means of destruction. Scientific and technical advance have, indeed, equipped war with a destructive power so enormously increased as to terrify the world. From a means of enrichment at others' expense, war has become merely a frightful means of destruction at the expense of all—the most absurd action that any people could commit.

Thus the great reversal of values has taken place. It has proceeded, we saw, from the fact that science and invention and industry have made it possible to capture many thousand times more productive energy from inanimate nature than was formerly captured by violence from animated nature.

The time predicted by Napoleon has arrived. The reign of war is approaching its end. "War is going to become an anachronism." The reign of industry is going to be universal. The warrior is ceasing to be master of men and things. The producer is becoming the foremost figure in humanity.

And at the same time there is foundering a whole political, economic, social, and cultural system, of which all the valuations and all the institutions were based on war and had their validity in the human acceptance of war.

“*Le monde va changer de base,*” says a line of the “Internationale”—the basis of the world is changing. It is neither a mere figure of speech nor a Utopian declaration; it is a statement of the reality. The whole world is shifting on to a new basis. This is the greatest revolution in all history. We are witnessing the crumbling away, slowly or rapidly, of all the valuations on which every human society has been built up since the beginning of time. And we are witnessing the birth and establishment and development, amid confusion and tumult and rebellion, or amid the hum of machinery, and steadily and surely wherever man takes thought, or adds to his mental stature, or labours, of the new valuations which will be the basis of the new world.

HUMANITY VERSUS WAR

I

Will the exposition of the truth concerning war suffice to induce humanity finally to abandon it and to build up peace on indestructible foundations? It would be the most dangerous of errors to suppose so. The elimination of war will give rise to a long and painful and probably violent struggle, of which the tactics are not yet determined. It is a problem of action, not of enlightenment. The problem of enlightenment has first to be solved before beginning the organizing work of the problem of action. But it has to be realized that the moment action begins the problem becomes one of manœuvring and of forces. What has to be done is not to convince or to demonstrate, but to furnish rational guidance for those who are already in action, convinced not by scientific reasoning but by their position, and in need of a fortifying of the spirit and a vision of the goal towards which they are fighting their way. They must more or less be given the means of *thinking out* their action, so that it may have a durable creative result.

Otherwise the revolt against war would be in great danger of leading the peoples into terrible chaos.

We have seen that war is a parasitic act, one of the origins of which is cannibalism, and an act which, even in its most complex and in appearance most rational forms, is merely a return to the wildest forms of animalism. We have seen that, without having arrived at this scientific comprehension of the phenomenon of war, immense masses of humanity are already against war, and that, should war come, these masses, having the material of war in their hands, would be in a position to refuse to carry it on. Is it enough to wait for the definite menace of war to set these anti-war masses in motion, in order to suppress war? There could be no worse error, for if one were to await the moment when these masses had in their hands the material of war one would only be placing multitudes of men in a situation in which they would be precipitated into a general war by their position. Imagine a general mobilization, withdrawing these masses from production. What happens? The cohesion of these immense masses is at once destroyed; they have no possibility of returning to their places of work within a day or a week of the time when developments call for decisions. Groups of producers no longer exist at that moment. There are only inchoate bands of men,

divorced entirely from production and delivered over to every prompting of instinct or mad impulse. What would they make of the war material in their hands? An arm against war? That is a contradiction in terms. Would they refuse to serve against a foreign country? Certainly; but equally certainly they would make use of their material for civil war. Most of the mobilized men will, no doubt, endeavour to escape alike from warring against the foreigner and from civil war; but in the midst of these masses of rebels against war new warlike minorities would form in every country, waging civil war on their own account. In the end these groups might form the nuclei of an army which would be the initial force of a new regime. And once more we should have a regime vitiated at the outset, founded, as it would be, on the acceptance of war.

There will be no real elimination of war and construction of the new state unless the refusal to serve takes place with the men in their places as producers, ready to set up the machinery of the new state based on the necessities of labour.

II

Need I tell the reader that in describing the necessary conditions for the elimination of war, I am ceasing to perform a purely scientific work?

I am taking up a position; I am taking part against war; I am myself entering into action. I am trying to trace the plan of an action with the objective of the suppression of war. My reasons are drawn from a scientific analysis. I have arrived at the conviction, based on a rational foundation, that war is contrary to the interest of humanity, that it is an evil and an entirely unnecessary evil, and that, if one desires human progress, this evil must be suppressed. In my desire for human progress I work henceforth for the suppression of war. I suppose the reader to be with me in this; if not, let him throw down this book; we have nothing in common. I am addressing myself to men capable of comprehending the reasons which I have adduced, and men who, having comprehended, have enough human feeling to undertake or support a course of action in conformity with the general interest of humanity. We will now examine together and reason out the conditions in which humanity finds itself placed at the moment of its moral revolt against war, and the means of action of which the peoples may usefully avail themselves for the suppression of war.

* * *

At present 90 per cent. of all men, perhaps more, regard war as an unspeakable evil, bene-

fitting no one. It might be inferred that the suppression of war could be secured at a blow, in a few weeks. It could not, however, and in spite of the virtually unanimous hostility to it the risks of war are greater than before 1914. Is it because the various nations suspect the good faith of their neighbours? That is incredible, for the countries which went through the war know very well the feelings of the mass of the soldiers, from their own experience. The reason for the nations' inability to act is quite different. It proceeds from the fact that at the moment of emerging from the war system the nations perceive that their whole society is intimately bound up with the war system, and they are unable to imagine what could replace it. Permit me a rather crude picture which, however, I think may explain the point. Suppose that at thirty degrees of frost a man discovers that his warm clothing is so verminous as ultimately to threaten his life, while to throw it off would be to court instant death from freezing. What would he do? In all probability he would prefer to live on, even at the cost of an uncomfortable death in a year's time. He would at least be so many months to the good. Such is humanity's attitude towards war. It has no other coat to put on than this of war, which may bring on it plague and cholera. It has a dim feeling that God or Nature

or Fate or some great benefactor will give it another coat before its last moment. But amid its present embarrassment it passively endures the activities of the war-mongers, with their ubiquitous stores of great masses of explosives.

III

One may set out a list of the opposing forces :

ON THE SIDE OF WAR—

Almost all the governments of the whole world, Socialist governments included; dominated either by the idea that war is just and useful, or that, good or evil, it is eternal;

Almost all the party political organizations, sharing the same feelings—governments and parties holding in their control all the machinery of public affairs, and charging one another across the frontiers with warlike intentions;

The manufacturers of war material, with a large part of the press of every country;

The Nationalist and Fascist parties, with their very limited following.

ON THE SIDE OF PEACE—

The peoples, with virtual unanimity, all parties alike, from Left to Right, citizens classed as reactionary just as much as those classed as

revolutionary. But leaderless, or almost so. The war party is well staffed but almost without troops; the peace party is an immense mass of troops almost without officers. I may point out that one cannot, for example, include among the officers of peace the official leaders of Catholic or Socialist groups; among the Catholic leaders the opposition to war is no more than a lifeless phrase, while the Socialist opposition to war is one of principle but not perceptibly of practice.

There are also on the the side of peace:

The great majority of the members of the teaching profession and, throughout the world, most of the foremost thinkers in science and technology;

The working-class organizations, but with little spirit, so far as the organizations affiliated to the Amsterdam International are concerned;

Finally, in a very cautious way, certain international financial institutions.

As for the Communists, who have no great influence in Europe, they are against war in principle, but they are organizing a proletarian war against Capitalism. We will return to them in a special reference.

So much for the effectives on either side. They are overwhelmingly on the side of peace. The intellectual superiority is also enormous on

that side. But the superiority in directing staff and in means of action on the side of war is, beyond any doubt, formidable.

It is a paradoxical situation, arising from the fact, confusedly sensed by the masses, that the whole political, economic, financial, and cultural system is built up on a constitutional system based on war.

IV

If there was nothing more to be done than to make peace between France and Germany, the matter would be difficult but, on the whole, relatively easy after the experience gained in France and Germany of the results of the war of 1914-1918. But what is needed is the renunciation of the whole system of war between the two countries, the system based on war between peoples. It is of no use to try to stop at the word Arbitration; that raises the whole question, for to embrace arbitration is to renounce the war system. And, in doing so, *to repudiate the war system throughout the world.*

That means challenging the right to supremacy of Western civilization—that of Europe and the United States—over the whole globe; this supremacy being founded throughout the world on Imperialism, that is, on the war system. And

that amounts to a challenge of the functioning of the whole economic organization of the modern world.

Modern capitalist economy, it should be observed, is essentially formed by a financial consortium (including the state banks, note banks, credit establishments, and the great commercial banks) which controls a circulation of capital of which the object is to keep going (*a*) a great group of European and American factories and works, and (*b*) a system of railway and maritime transport covering the whole world. Through this system Europe and America, controlling the whole world's fields of raw material, collect the raw material, distribute it among their factories and works, and send it out into the world in the form of manufactured products, securing a large part of the payment of the profits of small capitalism or the wages of white workers in the form of wheat, rice, cotton, and wool from the four quarters of the globe—with the maximum of profit for the financial apparatus and the minimum for the coloured populations of the whole world.

Consciously or not, the various governments and parties are simply agents of this system, and can do no other than serve it. The whole system has been built up through wars and expeditions in every continent by one state or another, and

is perpetuated only through the garrisons and fleets of Europe and America, placed at strategic points in the world for the surveillance of the seas and the great routes of world navigation. It has been a work of two centuries; but during the last fifty years the system has attained its limits in the world; since the world war it has formed a single whole, with a solidarity which has enabled it to dictate its will to states to such a degree that national sovereignties have become a fiction. Thus, to destroy the war system is to wreck the foundations of the whole economic system of the modern world (the Soviet Union excepted).

That is a very grave statement. But it is our duty to look the truth full in the face. We must not conceal from ourselves the fact that, if we reject the war system, we reject in the same breath the system which made what we call our prosperity. We shall open an economic crisis on a scale as yet unknown; a crisis which will be no mere abstraction but will find expression in the bankruptcy of the establishments directly bound up with the general functioning of imperialism; and, further, in very considerable industrial disturbances. It will, moreover, be a general crisis, affecting every form of society.

It is the presentiment of this crisis that accounts for the distress of humanity in face of the

problem of war and peace. For up to the present no one has said what system will replace the system founded on war.

I hasten to add that, personally, I regard this crisis as salutary for Europe, a crisis of rejuvenescence, through which the continent will experience a new prosperity and a new era of intellectual grandeur.

V

We must ask the reader's particular attention to this point. Our examination has not been made in order to give the feeling that peace is easy. It is not easy, and we have to face its difficulties. We have come now to the central point of the whole operation. We find that the economic structure of the world rests on the war system; and that if we reject the right of conquest we revolutionize this structure. It has been built up by superposed dominations, largely parasitic: the domination of the white race over the coloured races, of various ethnic groups over others, of people over people, dominations of classes, and of a few financial consortiums, the inspirers of the four great White imperialisms.

Look carefully at this edifice of dominations, which, for all their injustices, do nevertheless, for the moment, assure the world production

and distribution of commodities. Consider that if you carry the axe to the juridical base of this system you will bring down the whole edifice, and then you will either condemn considerable portions of humanity to famine, or at least to vast economic disturbances, or else you must build up another system. And it will not be a simple juridical system, built up by a few gentlemen in their libraries; a complete economic system has to be invented, an enormous machine requiring thousands of men to work it, and invented in the midst of the world's work, and without stopping the world's workshops. Whether you like it or not, so it must be. The change will not be produced, as people are too ready to tell us, by intoning a few magic formulæ, such as the famous Arbitration, Security, Disarmament, which may be read up and down and across without changing its value or significance. I do not want to disturb the people who think that matters will arrange themselves nicely in the perfumed atmosphere of the grand sessions of the League of Nations. But I am compelled to say that the labours of the League of Nations, useful as they may be, do not carry us very far. They are useful in so far as they show that the governments are compelled to take account of the feelings of their peoples, just as, in former times, kings were obliged to tolerate alongside

their thrones embryo parliaments which could do nothing, but in which the habit grew of affirming the principles of the new constitutionalism. So it is with that international parliament, the League of Nations. It is virtually without any intrinsic power, but it is compelling the governments to cry Peace, Peace while they think of war. In that way it is compelling them to destroy the psychological foundations of the mobilization which they are all preparing; and that is excellent.

But do not suppose that peace will be assured through the efforts of the League of Nations, itself formed by states whose every institution rests on the war system, states which are working with frenzy in preparation for war. Do not be surprised at this official hypocrisy, which deceives none of those who are taking part in the farce. It reflects the situation which I was describing just now, in which one sees the peoples in favour of peace and their governments working for war. So it will be until states change their nature.

How can one suppose that the great world powers, the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and France, as they are constituted today, are going to renounce the right of conquest and the war system? It would mean the almost instantaneous engulfing of an enormous part of

their economy. In the case of Britain, it would be the end of all her power, of her whole economic power. The economic system of these three powers would receive a mortal blow.

What is Britain's right to the control of Egypt? The right of war. What is her right to the exploitation of India? Or to the surveillance of virtually all the sea routes? Or the right of France to the exploitation of Africa, Indo-China, Madagascar? Or the right of the United States to the Philippines, Cuba, Panama? The right of war in every case. Observe that this right has reference to territories in which there are harvested or collected products indispensable to humanity, or to points on the globe which are the cross-roads of the principal routes—Gibraltar, Port Said, Aden and Djibouti, Singapore, Panama—points at which the traffic cannot be stopped for an instant.

Suppose that the system were genuinely abandoned, that the Great Powers declared their renunciation of the right of war, and you can imagine how with no great delay every European domination would be rejected and overthrown. The consequence, as things are, would be the arrest of world transport, famine in cotton, wool, sugar, rice, coffee, meat, in all Europe, an economic upheaval such as has never been known, and, to enliven the picture, some great conflagra-

tions in Asia and Africa. You can imagine all this just as well as I, without attempting to form a picture of Singapore in the hands of the Malays, Aden and Djibouti in the hands of the Somali, the Suez Canal controlled by Bedouins, and so on.

Yet, so long as Western civilization dominates the world by the war system, there will be no hope of peace, for all the Western powers remain equipped for war, not only in order to maintain their domination abroad but to maintain order within their frontiers and to support their own imperialisms against those of their rivals.

I have not written this in order to sap the courage of the reader in face of the enormous task to be accomplished. I have written it in order to place every man of good faith and good will on his guard against the illusions that one is too prone to entertain in questions of peace, in which it is too readily supposed that good faith and good will are all that is needed. The achievement of peace is a task which seems superhuman when one visualizes the conditions of its achievement.

Yet, though the reader might be tempted to suppose that peace can only be an achievement of the most distant future, I want to demonstrate to him that it is quite close. It is for that reason that I am setting out to show him the work

which we must prepare to do on the day when "peace breaks out"—the day of the explosion which will come from the conflict of the imperialisms which to-day rule the economic life of the world.

VI

In face of the difficulty of organizing the economics of the peace system, many men might be tempted to leave themselves to the play of unknown forces or even to abdicate to the existing imperialisms. But history does not permit men to step out of the world's arena. Men must act; only gods can look on. We are compelled to take sides, to enter one camp or the other. For the succession of imperialisms is approaching its end, and the servitors of peace are called to take into their hands the organization of the world.

There is only one great system of exploitation of the world, the capitalist system. But it has three vital centres—Washington, London, and Paris—Berlin (Europe). It is from these three centres that the forces proceed which the system sets in motion—forces of invention, of production, and of expansion, the whole utilizing the ethnic qualities of the great social groups. Remaining under the domination of a minority,

the system is so operated that any invention which increases production forces the group concerned to seek expansion, since the individuals of the group are so remunerated that they are unable themselves to consume the increased production. The directors of the group, in order to keep their factories and works in full swing, are obliged to search for fresh territories in which to sell their excess of production. The great groups accordingly practise imperialism, seeking to secure political control of new territories to be incorporated in their system. Inevitably they come into rivalry for the control of these territories. And inevitably the moment is coming when the whole of the world is taken up, and the imperialisms will oppose one another through their political organs; that is, when they will have no course left but to go to war to liquidate their differences. It is at that moment that, with the forces of invention continually adding to the capacity for production, and commercial expansion becoming impossible, works and factories will be reduced to closing down; and within the groups there will be produced the social ferment which tends, quite apart from any theory or doctrine, to explode the system through war or revolution.

The leaders of the imperialisms prefer war, which seems to them to provide an easy way of

escape from revolution. The idea emerges of a continental war. To-day, however, we are finding that peoples are as violently averse to a continental war as to national ones. More intelligent than the small capitalists who were responsible for the war of 1914-1918, the leaders of the three great imperialisms have no difficulty in perceiving that open war between them would bring a world-wide revolution. It is very easy to see that in a conflict between European and American imperialism the latter would proceed to engineer explosions in all the European possessions in Asia and elsewhere. In short, the rival imperialisms would commit suicide in one another's presence. The launching of a war of the imperialisms would be the signal for a world revolution, constructive or destructive.

Then, one of two things must come. Either the imperialisms will be unable to resist the pressure of the forces which they have let loose, and the war will have come which will explode them, leaving to the producers the task of taking in their hands the organization of peace—or the imperialisms will themselves aim at peace, and will try to effect a unification of world capital. But in that case they will be compelled to renounce the system of war. And then, no longer having the psychological means of setting nations at one another's ears, they will themselves destroy

the basis of their world domination. In that case they will themselves be precipitating the crisis through which the world will seek its new organization.

In either case it will be for the men of peace to take into their hands this new organization. Whichever way we turn, we find tasks awaiting us, and we must get immediately to work. For the task is not going to begin in half a century; it will begin much sooner, probably in the present decade. We have entered the critical period in which the imperialisms find themselves in the acute mutual opposition which I have just been describing. That is the first sign of the great world crisis in which the bases of the system are threatened.

VII

Humanity is faced with the choice between war and revolution—and it is no academic question; it is a practical problem. It is a problem of the utmost actuality, as we have just seen. All Europe's political crises are due to this cause and no other. For ten years past we have been unceasingly passing from one group to its anti-thesis; Europe has passed from Fascism to Communism and back again unrestingly: clinging to the man-at-arms when Communism terrified her,

and giving herself to Communism when the fear of war assailed her.

In no country has a new form of state yet appeared plainly. All Europe has remained true to the old forms, survivals, whether Fascist, Parliamentary, Democratic, or even Socialist, of the princely state, reconstituted with superficial changes but with the power still essentially in military hands and founded on war. This is the basic reason of the powerlessness of the governments to solve the problems with which Europe is faced.

In its existing forms the European state could not take over the governance of the world of peace. It is a grave error to imagine that the European state is a really democratic one; it remains soaked in the traditions of the princely state. It is governed by a party, a minority which seized power by an act of civil war and holds on to it by military and police means. No doubt such a government tends in general to serve popular ends, but it has not yet succeeded in discovering the true basis of modern power, still less of building on it. It restricted itself to the collection of forces for wresting power from dynasties or fundamentally military dictatorships; and it has retained the essentials of the means of domination which were employed by the princely state.

The democratic parties have formed themselves in the manner of the clans which disputed power among themselves under dynastic rule or within an aristocracy. They are not in the least groups formed to serve production; they are associations foreign to production and to the life of the producer, and seek to justify their existence by means of ideologies to which they try to subject the producers. They act exactly on the same lines as the theocracies or aristocracies, which, in order to lend cohesion to the dominating minorities, manufactured for them ideologies of which a knowledge was required of all members of the dominant group—from the moment when it ceased to be able to support itself entirely by force of arms.

Apart from that, dominant minorities have always sought to justify their rule by a theology or an ideology. The inventors of ideologies have entered into the inheritance of the theocrats who succeeded in subordinating to their rule the military element—an element without the intelligence needed for the manufacture of arguments to justify its own dictatorship. The democratic parties make lavish use of the ideological method, which, however, is quite unserviceable in the modern world. That prevents them from working for the creation of the modern state, but it helps them to keep in their hands the

semblance of power which has been left to them.

Political parties are fighting organs which had their usefulness at the moment when the theocratic or dynastic or aristocratic powers had to be overthrown—powers resting all of them on force, but appealing to intellectual sanctions, since they had to recruit soldiers from among the dominated people. By their influence on opinion the democratic parties destroyed these intellectual bases of the old powers; then, finding themselves faced by complete ideological systems, they were led to construct equally complete ideologies of their own, by the aid of which they were able themselves to recruit the forces with which they opposed the former powers.

In its time the system had its value, but to-day it tends to become parasitic. Parties manufacture ideologies in order to justify their maintenance of power, though they render no services to production. Ideological political groupings seek recognition of their mastery of the state simply on the strength of their ideology. They imagine that the basis of power is ideological because they were invested with power at the moment when they were the agents of protest against tyrannical powers. Ideology had its negative efficacy in the rejection of the claims of powers

resting on a military basis and in depriving them of all psychological support. But constructive efficacy it has none.

Parties with an ideological basis are to-day no more than transpositions of the groups which formerly disputed power among one another. They conceive their action after the fashion of the old minorities which held a sword above the heads of the producers; but instead of themselves holding the sword they have it wielded by the army or police. They exercise their power after the fashion of the old clans, sharing out the benefits of ruling among their partisans. And they follow the practice of the earlier powers in justifying their hold of power on the ground that they have to maintain a struggle with the former powers, who want to come back, or against the foreigner. In other words, they govern through precisely the same means as their predecessors. In their hands the state remains essentially what it was before the revolution, an instrument of domination in the hands of a party, not the organ of the co-ordination of all the creative and productive forces of the social group.

That is why the existing democratic parties are not in a position to be able to bring us out of the war system. They have remained within it; they have retained its organs and its culture.

They can do no more than give official voice to the aspiration of the peoples towards peace. That is true of the French Radical Party, which has remained loyal to the traditions of patriotic Jacobinism, and it is equally true of the Socialist Party in various Western countries, although Socialism is by definition international. The customs and the institutions of the princely state carry such force that the popular parties, although pacifist, are unable to escape from the old ideological method, according to which peace must be the result of the arrival in power of the men who hold pacifist opinions. They fail to realize that what is wanted is a complete change of the system of government.

It must be admitted, however, that it is very difficult to envisage the change. I am not ashamed to confess that it took me thirty years to arrive at the conception of the new system which I have to-day, the system towards which we are all tending. Our minds are so impregnated with the ideas of the old system that it requires a very real effort to rid ourselves of them.

VIII

Two states recently formed have tried to get away from the war system—the United States of America and the Soviet Union. But both

appear to be returning to the older form of the state.

There has been a good deal of raillery in Europe over the American proposal for the outlawry of war. The proposal seemed to the scoffers to be a perfect expression of American hypocrisy masking its war manufactures beneath pacifist declarations. But let us be just to the United States; their proposal was entirely sincere, and proceeded from a doctrine entirely foreign to the old doctrine of the warrior states.

It is quite true that there is such a thing as American imperialism. But it is an economic and not a military imperialism. European imperialisms have almost always begun with a military expedition, after which, having taken possession of territory and raw materials, they have proceeded with the exploitation of their conquests. The American method has been quite different. American imperialism first exports its capital to the countries which it wants to control, i.e. sends machinery and material, accompanied by financiers, technicians, engineers, and ship-builders. Thus it proceeds with the exploitation of a country; it comes as a producer and not a fighter. Then, having set to work, it wants a share in public life. It is then that protests arise, those interested considering that their sovereignty is being infringed. If a conflict arises, the United

States intervene through their army, not as a conquering force but as a police force, an entirely different thing. That is exactly what happened in Nicaragua, where the United States consider that they have performed a police operation, to bring to reason the nationals of Nicaragua, who were refusing to recognize the rights of the American producers who had established themselves on Nicaraguan soil.

Europe has not yet realized the essential difference between this system and its own. It is true that since the world war, and especially in recent years, there has been a very marked change in American policy, which seems to be embarking on the broad and dangerous path of militarism. It is manifest that the American film industry is sending out films which exalt the sentiments suited to the making of soldiers for an imperialism which is beginning to make too great a display of its navy and air force. When the members of the American Legion came to France and its delegates organized a procession through Paris, the French, who are liberating themselves from militarism, were horrified at the revelation of an American militarism, taking on, it is true, grotesque forms, but all the more disquieting for its stupidity. It is too early to speak of a true militarism of the United States ;

but the present indications are disquieting. Moreover, an internal malady seems to be developing in the United States which will call for police measures of such a nature that the state may be transformed: the organization of bands of bootleggers and gangsters which are assuming such importance as to form a first-class problem for the state. It is well known that there has been a development in North America of armed bands against which the police have up to now been impotent, when they have not been guilty of complicity in their operations. The development of these bands is no mere accident. It is a national outcome of the organization of American society, and in particular of what must be called its culture, its cultural values, or, perhaps one should say, the social values of its economic dynamism. We shall analyse this when we have to speak of culture in general. Here I simply point out that the development of criminal bands in the United States proceeds from the essential character of their social life, and that it is taking on such dimensions that its suppression may demand operations so drastic as profoundly to modify the character of the state.

In a word, the American state, which was of the technical type, is evolving towards a type which it is not easy to forecast, but which appears

to be bound to be strongly impregnated with militarism.

The Soviet Union is the first Eurasian state which has made the attempt to break fundamentally with the war system. It is well known how Lenin and Trotzky, applying a tactic which at the time was called defeatism, themselves dislocated the Russian army organization in the face of the enemy, and at Brest-Litovsk abandoned everything that goes by the name of military honour. The Western world was unable to comprehend exactly what was happening. Its opinion was that the Bolsheviks were just bandits, who were installing themselves in power at the price of an unprecedented humiliation for Russia; it was even believed that Lenin and Trotzky were agents of Germany, and were selling their country to the Kaiser. But it did not take long to discover that the German victory in Russia was entirely illusory. The Soviet state, which had been believed to be the instrument of Germany, was perfectly prepared to send the German state sky-high, and the German state was saved by the Allies.

Europe has not yet realized what it was that Lenin and Trotzky were doing at Brest-Litovsk. It has not realized that the Bolsheviks were setting out to repudiate the whole constitutional system based on war, and were beginning to

organize the peoples against the militarist minorities of the whole world. The Soviet state was deliberately abandoning the war system. But it hastily returned to it. Did it return entirely of its own accord, or did the powers compel it to do so? I have not the means of solving this historic problem. What is certain is that a Red Army was constituted by the Soviet state. Probably it was brought together originally against the Whites, who were receiving the support of Europe; in 1920 and 1921 it became an offensive army, launched by the U.S.S.R. on a specifically warlike operation against capitalist Europe.

At once there was constituted a Soviet, a proletarian, militarism. The Soviet leaders clearly represent the Red Army as an army destined to liberate the peoples from capitalism, just as the French Revolution represented the armies of the Republic as the liberators of the peoples from their tyrants. But there might come from the Red Army a militarism as strong as that which came out of the French revolutionary armies. The Soviet state is, in point of fact, maintaining the Red Army not as a simple emergency instrument of defence, but as an essential part of its organism, and it is giving the army a very high rank in the life of the U.S.S.R., just as it ranks high the value of proletarian militarism in the

new culture which it is elaborating and propagating in all the territories which it controls.

On the other hand, it does not seem to have made any use of this militarism in a cultural way against the peoples which are incorporated in the U.S.S.R. One of the most curious features of the Soviet state is, indeed, that it recognizes the right of every ethnic group to live in accordance with its own ethnic characteristics; in strong contrast to the Tsarist state, which Russified all the peoples of the Empire, the Soviet state accords full respect to the language of each people; and while the imperialist states everywhere practise cultural imperialism and only give access to scientific education to those of their subjects who accept their language and culture, the Soviet state provides the means of the development of the technical resources of each of its peoples, and presents its culture to them in their own language.

Here is certainly an innovation of capital importance in the relations of peoples with one another. Up to now the imperialist states have made use of their armies in order to establish domination over various peoples, and subsequently facilitated their domination by setting the peoples against one another through their linguistic and cultural differences. For the first

time a state with an army at its disposal is allowing entire cultural liberty to peoples whom it could easily dominate, and is associating them with its labours. Hitherto this method had only been employed by religions, especially the Christian religion, and in particular by Catholicism. But not in the life of the states; not in economic life. This must be put on record in favour of the Soviet state, as clear proof of its rejection of the methods of militarism.

Alongside this very characteristic innovation, however, the Soviet state is continuing the practice of a very active militarism which seems to be growing rather than declining. Within the country, military means are no longer availed of against ethnic minorities, but there is no question that they are extensively resorted to to break down resistance to general socialization. There is not abundant information on this point, but there is enough to make it clear that the Soviet state frequently fails in the task of socialization by economic means, and employs military means to compel the peasants to submit to its methods. Let me say here that I am refraining from criticizing the employment of force for the transfer or socialization of property; I am merely stating the fact that the Soviet state is everywhere, and perhaps frequently, employing military force in order to compel the application

of methods of working which are not accepted by the workers.

Finally, the Soviet state is developing a real proletarian militarism, used, it may be, for the maintenance of order while the organs of the state are in process of creation, but of which there is reason to think, from all the information that comes to hand, that it is strongly animated by a desire for a warlike offensive against the capitalist states. The information on the subject all points in the same direction. I am introducing no personal appreciation; I am merely passing on what I have heard and learnt, especially from those who are in sympathy with Communism and from Communists themselves. It must be borne in mind that the capitalist states are beyond question inclined towards war against the U.S.S.R., and that fact goes some way towards justifying the existence of the Red Army. But it seems quite clear that the Red Army is organized and manœuvred according to the principles of militarism pure and simple, though in the service of proletarian interests.

There is no hiding the fact that that would be a great menace to the future of Europe and Asia; for there would be reason to fear that in the event of war breaking out in Europe there might be an explosion of proletarian or Soviet militarism which might next become Russian or

Slav, just as the militarism of the French Revolution developed into the French militarism which poisoned Europe for a century. It is certain that many Tsarist officers who rallied to the Soviet state conceived Soviet evolution as the military expansion of Slavism; they await with impatience the coming of the war which would launch the proletarian armies against Europe, and would arouse a Slav military enthusiasm analogous to that which was aroused in France by the armies of the Revolution and the Empire.

A similar movement would very quickly result in a reawakening of militarism throughout Europe. That would produce a grave set-back in the building of the new world, just as the expansion of French revolutionary militarism consolidated during a whole century the militarisms of the European dynasties, and ended in retarding the democratization of Europe.

It follows from this analysis that there is no non-militarist state in existence at present, at all events among the powers whose decisions are of dominating influence in international life. It should, however, be mentioned that the Scandinavian states, and, above all, Denmark, have entered resolutely on the path of the elimination of militarism. But this group of progressive states is unable, for the moment, to play a decisive part

in European life. It is none the less true that the movement for peace may find in this group a very important source of strength.

We may conclude that in the existing state of the world there are numberless risks of war, only faint official chances of peace, and very little means of organizing peace. Yet peace has on its side both numbers and intelligence. The means must, therefore, be found of utilizing mass and intellectual strength.

IX

The problem of action is always one of securing the most favourable terrain and manœuvring the greater force at the point of the least resistance. In the struggle against war, where is the terrain? Where is the instrument for manœuvring? Where is the maximum force, and where the least resistance?

The experience of history gives a clear answer to the first question. One must not take up position on the terrain of the old state; it is there that one finds the old forces of the military state occupying very strong positions—the army itself, the police, all the apparatus of repression and corruption that the minorities wield against the producers. To get control of these organs, it is necessary to withdraw from work and so to enter

a formation exterior to production and necessarily parasitic, and if one does get control of them one can only make use of them for the old purpose of domination, and not against war. It would be an absurdity to attempt to manœuvre the old police and the army against war, seeing that they only exist for war or domination.

Nor will one take up position along the main roads or in the market place, those scenes of past insurrections. A demonstration is a grotesque and vain operation the moment it is in no way the sign of an action accomplished. Risings belong to the warlike type of action; they are an act of war; they place those who resort to them on the plane of war.

The chosen terrain can neither be the state, nor the market place, nor the open road. The only terrain suited to the worker, the producer, is the workshop. It is there that he is strong and his opponents weak.

The second question is: where is the instrument to apply in the manœuvre against war? Clearly the instrument is man's intelligence—the faculty which, though destined to invent economy of effort for the minimization of muscular fatigue, has been kept in bondage for ages by the instinct of murder, the carnivorous instinct, which led man into war in the search for an escape from labour.

The creative intelligence against the carnivorous instinct—and who will be the representatives of that intelligence? Men specialized in intellectual research, in invention. I am not speaking of those intellectuals who are merely ideologues. I am speaking of those who are discoverers, inventors of methods and machines, scientists, professors, inventors, technicians. Be it noted at once that a considerable proportion of these men are against war; also that they are the authors, the creators of the “wealth” of the modern world; and that, by a strange topsy-turvydom, they have been kept aloof from public life and public affairs by those who have taken the proceeds of their labour.

There is no contesting the fact that the enrichment of the world for a century past has come from scientific labour and the spread of knowledge through education. An ancient juridical system, bound up, too, with the war system, has produced the result that the enormous addition to the world's wealth has become the property of men who are nothing but profit-gatherers and have not been capable of returning to the laboratories even a small part of the wealth which came from their retorts. Science, technique, education—these are our natural allies in the struggle against war—these and their representatives, who are the creators of the new wealth of the

world and should be called upon to be its administrators.

We do not exclude less qualified intellectuals, nor the man who has the capacity of winning the ear of the crowd. But we say that the bulk of the intellectuals called on to manœuvre against war must be formed by the representatives of science, technique, and education. It will be objected that these men know little of public life. We reply that we are well aware of that, and that it is for that reason that we address ourselves to them. We are not going on to the terrain of what is called politics; that is, to the places in which the clans who compete for power assemble. We are placing ourselves on the terrain on which one finds the high faculties of human inventiveness, and where man is daily given a little more power over his environment. And why? Because it is there that we are at the source of the true Power of the new world. It is there that we shall find the maximum force for manœuvring against war.

For we have to escape from the world of illusions in which we remain in spite of the changes in the world. We must go in search of Power where Power is, and not where there is nothing left but its phantom. The mistake into which we fall if we try to work on the world of to-day is that we turn to the old forms of power,

to what is called political power—a thing of which the powerlessness stands out more clearly every day.

In the world of the past, power was political, maintained, that is, by the sword in the market place and on the high road, the power of man over man, through which the warrior compelled the producer to give up to him a part of the fruits of his labour—the power which set up embattled castles above the towns or on the edge of the forests, which sent its men not into the workshop or the fields, but into the market place and the high road, to seize levies on the product of labour.

It is this old form of power that has fallen into the hands of the parties, first through risings, then through elections. But it has remained essentially the same power. It has always been detached from production, exterior to production. And it has ceased to be the real power because it has ceased to be the means through which the maximum of force is assembled at one point. It was the power—that is, the principal force of the nation—when it was able to get together an army for its sole use, an army stronger than any private army, and forming a group more powerful than the country's economic system. But it ceased to be the power from the day when there were constituted,

apart from the market place and the high road, in offices, counting houses, factories, the directing organs of modern economic life—organs which by the forming of railway and shipping companies, by coal and gas and electricity production, and so on, were in a position to make a levy on all production, not only at the moment when it passed along the high road or into the market place, but at every working moment.

It was then that economic power was born, to become ultimately more powerful than the power that is called political, and now, in consequence, itself Power pure and simple. The men who control this true power have known how to take up position at the places where the results of the multiplication of human forces by science and technique were concentrated. They have now in their hands a considerable part of these forces, thanks to which they hold the reality of power, which they allow to be exercised nominally by the representatives of the political parties, especially of the parties of the Centre and Right, which have not the means of arousing a popular movement in their favour.

Fortunately, this economic power is divided. It is shared between two main tendencies, financial and industrial, the former fairly favourable to peace, the latter inclined to be bellicist. In practice, both tendencies work together

against the peoples. Against this power, the true mistress of War and Peace, the representatives of political power have become impotent. There is no possibility of their regaining with their political strength the mastery of the economic power: if they did so by a lucky electoral stroke, they would lose on the morrow all that they had gained. They can only humble the economic power if they take from it the source of its strength—the banks, the mines, the great industrial establishments, and so on. Then, however, they would themselves become the economic power, and of this they are not capable.

So much has been said in order to emphasize the fact that to-day there is no power save that which is born in the economic world out of the fact that it creates a thousand times more real force than can be conquered by the army, the police, or the vote; and the facts that it is unceasingly producing and that those who are its masters are able to make a levy on man's labour at every moment of production. And it is for that reason that we said just now that the terrain of the battle to be fought against war is that of the workshop: that is, of economic life; for it is there that *power* is formed to-day, and it is there only that it can be seized. But if it is there that the effect of power forms, crystallizes, its source is elsewhere. The source of power is the

human intelligence, acting on the plane of science, and expressing itself in every form of labour. Which amounts to saying that power, though sequestered to-day by the holders of the legal title to the results of the general production, comes from Science, that is to say the laboratory; from Technique, that is to say the works managements; and from Labour, that is to say the factory or the field. The force to be manœuvred against war is therefore that of the actual power of creation, for it is by means of this power that it is possible to cut off supplies from war, by means of this power that it is possible to set against the fighters, if any remain, such forces that they would be destroyed as parasites, in a struggle as inglorious as the struggle can be between vermin and the chemistry which destroys them.

There remains to be discovered the point of least resistance, the weak point in the armour of the powers who to-day are the open or occult masters of war and peace, the point at which the power which we have just defined can strike in order to declare and establish its mastery. This point is clearly the point of articulation between the bloodless political power and the economic power which maintains it. It is there that the weakness of the existing system lies; nominally democratic, it is lost as soon as it ceases to be

supported by the plutocracy; plutocratic in essence, it provokes revolt as soon as it ceases to be masked by the democratic label.

To sum up, the struggle against war is likely to have the best chances of success if it is carried on (1) in the field of production, in all places of work, where it is possible effectively to unite, without withdrawing them from their work, those who have the power of starving war out, and of furnishing the forces of the power which aims at organizing peace; (2) by the power which creates wealth—Science, Technique, Labour; (3) against the coalition of plutocracies and bellicist politicians who exploit the state under the name of democracy.

It is simply a question of organization and of choice of means. The forces to be assembled are greatly superior to the forces of war, which becomes an impossibility from the moment when it is refused all support by Science, Technique, and Labour.

But it must be realized that the operation to be performed is a very different thing from a simple substitution of persons, a totally different thing from a change of government. It is a complete revolution, which was begun by the French Revolution, and of which only the preliminary stages have been accomplished. This will be seen when we come to consider the obstacles which

have to be removed and the institutions which have to be built up.

The world of the past was dominated by the warrior. The new world must be under the direction of the producer. Its culture, its law, its institutions are irreconcilable with those of its predecessor, which to this day are those under which we live.

IDEOLOGIES AND INSTITUTIONS TO
BE DESTROYED

I

It is impossible to organize peace with the organs and the spirit of our existing societies. I insist emphatically on this. It has to be realized that in order to achieve peace it is not enough to get the heads of the states and the governments to speak words of peace. It is necessary to destroy all the ideologies and the institutions of the world of the past, and to create new institutions and a new culture. It has to be realized that the world of the past is organized in every quarter on the war system and for making war. It produces war as a tree brings forth its fruits. The state and its services, its public works, its public education, its diplomacy, all function for war; its juridical institutions, for war; family life and national customs, for war; the economic system rests on old warlike valuations; the culture is a culture of warrior societies, and our very code of good manners includes I do not know how many symbols which are warlike in origin. It is all this that quite naturally produces war; it is

all this that has to be destroyed, and it may be imagined that it is a formidable task.

Consider the immense labour of falsification and corruption that must have been required in order to bring a civilization which dates from the Decalogue, including the commandment "thou shalt not kill," to the point at which the faculty of killing is invested almost with religious consecrations. All this immense corruption, this age-long falsification has been the result of the associated work of countless interests, to-day bound together by hereditary ties; on these ties there have been built up institutions of venerable appearance, a whole world. That has to be destroyed in order to build the foundation of peace. If it is not destroyed systematically, rationally, coldly, you may rest assured that the moment will come when it will explode, amid terrible convulsions. It would be better to perform the operation in cold blood.

- You may, of course, be tempted to think that I am exaggerating. I shall proceed to adduce a certain amount of evidence in support of what I have laid down.

II

To begin with the idea of national sovereignty. As it is conceived at the present day it is irreconcilable with peace. It reserves the full right of a

state to resort to war if the honour or the fundamental interests of the state or people or nation are menaced. Such a conception renders peace absolutely impossible; to begin with, because it admits the principle that the resort to war can settle a certain amount of quarrels in conformity with human interests, which is not true; and secondly because the principle leaves to the state interested the right of being the judge in its own cause. So long as the existing principle of absolute national sovereignty is recognized, it will be utterly impossible to organize peace.

One must make one's choice: if one is for peace, one must roundly repudiate the right of war for national sovereignty. The law which is applicable to individuals must be applied to states: to be ready to commit collective murder is as criminal as to be ready to commit individual murder. If one wishes to maintain the principle of national sovereignty as it is recognized to-day, one has no right to call oneself a partisan of peace. One is living still in the bellicist system, in which the right of states to go to war is recognized. It is precisely that that we have to deny—the right of states to go to war.

The moment the principle of national sovereignty is admitted, and consequently the right of a people, a nation, a state to go to war, everything else follows: the state and all its institu-

tions will be founded on the war system. And you will see what that involves. To begin with, it is impossible to achieve a truly democratic state. True democracy, which implies the free adhesion of individuals to the decisions of the state, is essentially opposed to war, and even to the army. From the moment when the nineteenth-century state, which called itself democratic, accepted the old princely right of war, it was obliged to remain authoritarian, and consequently undemocratic. The right of the state to wage war was a logical thing with princes, kings, and emperors; their power was founded on the war system, on the right of conquest. They could not have renounced that system without abdicating. Princes, kings, and emperors have disappeared, but the war system has remained. The peoples failed to notice that they had been given a poisonous present. It was given them by warlike or parasitic minorities who wanted to continue to live within the democracy, while compelling the democracy to put their own principle into practice under the name of national defence.

That is why, since 1789, there has been a constant struggle in the European democracies between true democracy and the military parties. The democratic urge has been so powerful that they have had to take it into account, not openly repudiating it but evading it. It would have

been impossible to get war by a referendum. It was obtained by depriving the democracy of its essential rights. And under a democratic label the state has remained the authoritarian state; that is, the state which disposes of the lives of its subjects without their consent, and which bases its whole life on decisions made by its authority. Thus the democratic state, instead of being the citizens' central organ for public services, remained the organ of an authority exterior to the citizens, an authority imposing on them the policy proceeding from the interests and the ideology of the group which exploits the state by occult means.

III

The state remained purely and simply Authority. It is not competence, it is not public service: it is authority; that is, it is owed particular respect on account of its origin. Its employees are something different from the employees of a collective service; they are clothed with a prestige which comes neither from competence nor from work performed, but from the mysterious regions in which supreme power is formed. The essential functions of the state are the functions of authority, a thing which had its full justification when the agents of the state were the representatives, the delegates of the prince; that is, of the head of

the band which originally created the military state. The state as an expression of authority is an anachronism, a survival of the military state.

The survival is due to the fact that the democracies simply took over the state from the monarchies and tyrannies, without realizing that they needed to modify it so profoundly as virtually to change its nature. The democracies failed to realize that it was no part of their duty to take over from the monarchies a scourge to scourge themselves with. Their task should have been to create a new organ of the public interest.

The old state was the organ of the authority by means of which a parasitic class, originally military, maintained its power over the producers. The new state ought to be the organ of coordination of the free contributions of the citizens to the public services. Actually, these are two organs which have nothing in common. But from the fact that we had given them the same name, we confused them, and those to whom we entrusted the task of organizing the new state simply copied the old one.

This is plainly visible in the fiscal systems of the European democracies, which realized in 1789 that the new system of revenue collection ought to be based on the contributive system, but returned to the system of taxation, which is inapplicable to a democracy. In a democracy the

general expenditure of the nation ought to be covered by a free contribution from the citizens, the amount of which is fixed by the assembly of representatives, acting as the delegates of the citizens. The principle is that the citizens, agreeing to live together as a society, contribute according to their means towards the support of the collective services. In other words, they do not pay taxes but send in their contributions, which is an entirely and essentially different thing, the tax not being discussed but imposed, as its name indicates, and not being subject to discussion. The contribution is the part freely levied by a producer on the product of his own labour to meet the cost of the collective services; the tax is nothing but the tribute imposed by the conqueror on the conquered. We have not yet emerged from the tax system. Our whole fiscal system will have to be recast and transformed into a contributive system.

The whole state functions on the authoritarian principle. It was founded in order to establish a conquest, by military measures, and it permits no discussion either of its nature or of its actions. It sets out to function as the command of an army functions, with no discussion tolerated. The peoples are still so close to the old state of submission that the officials' abuse of power seems to them almost the natural thing,

where it should be placed on the same footing as that of a grocer or any producer who deceives his customer or employer with his goods or output.

Situations in the state services are not yet regarded by the citizens as employment of the same sort as in any other enterprise: they are posts of privilege of which the representatives of the successful parties dispose. Republics are frequently criticized in regard to their officials, the number of which is said to increase in accordance with a law implicit in the nature of democratic corruption. The criticism is founded on fact; yet it is misdirected. The plague of democratic officialism arises simply from the fact that the democracies have retained the princely state, in which the profits of employment went to those who enjoyed the favour of the prince.

It is useless for the state to call itself democratic: it has remained authoritarian and military to such a degree that in public ceremonies the civil representatives of the powers that be come after those of the army in order of precedence. Indeed, in all circumstances in which the representatives of the civil power uncover, those of the military power keep on their hats or helmets, even outside their own field of command. When the king of a tenth-rate state and the president of a republic which is also a

Great Power meet, the king follows the rules of military form, while the president follows those of civil etiquette. At the moment of a march-past of troops, the king keeps his helmet on his head; the president holds his hat in his hand. This small detail passes unnoticed in general and calls forth no protest, so deep-rooted is the habit of subordination to the military power, even in those societies of ours in which the military function has fallen into great discredit.

This survival of the princely and military state under the label of democracy renders very difficult the conduct of the republics which pass for democratic. The royalists and militarists have had the advantage of basing their propaganda on the hidden principle of the state; the republicans, on the other hand, have been very embarrassed by the necessity of reconciling democracy with a state of which the vital necessities are opposed to democracy. They are overcoming the difficulty by constituting in the midst of the democratic parties unitary organs which may more or less assure the manœuvring of the old authoritarian state. They also try to republicanize the professional army, though, naturally, they never succeed in this, the army and the republic being irreconcilable. In spite of this difficulty, the republican system has always triumphed in Europe. It had no serious diffi-

culties until after the war of 1914-1918, when the military parties took advantage of the feeling among the ex-combatants to organize a sort of neo-militarism, on which has been founded the Fascism of Italy, Poland, Hungary, Portugal, and so on.

The republican parties have, however, been constantly brought back to the essential difficulty by the very life of the state, to which is presented as its own special objective what is called national defence—and, it has to be admitted, presented with the consent of a large part of the nation. The immense majority of citizens consider that the only thing that matters is work, and they are a thousand times right. But they have not yet brought that consideration into play in their judgments of the state. They would be greatly astonished if they were told that the state should be the coordinating organ of the creative energies of the social group. They have been told the opposite so often that they do not dream that this is so; and it seems to them to be quite natural that the principal function of the state should be the organization of national defence. The representatives of the state, for their part, abandon economic activities to private initiative.

It follows that public life to-day is a mixture of fictions and mystifications. There is no talk of economic organization, the only thing which

interests the citizens; the theory is spread that this is not within the competence of the state. And there is no talk any longer of the military occupations of the state, for fear of arousing general protest. Apparently, public life is supposed to be confined to so-called political discussion, which interests nobody; meanwhile, behind this fiction and mystification, there is being set up a double dictatorship, economic and military. The republican state is leaving the economic dictatorship to financial and industrial committees, regarding economic life as something on a lower plane, and is devoting its efforts to "national defence," which is the pivot of its activities in every domain. It so organizes education as to serve the requirements of national defence. It concerns itself with agriculture and industry and trade not for the sake of the general prosperity but to meet the requirements of war. After the world war, instead of seeing at last that provision for the needs of war brings the nation to a dead end, the politicians were obsessed with the idea of general militarization. They had suffered from charges of having made inadequate military preparations, and had been greatly embarrassed. They meant to show that they would do better than the soldiers, and France had the spectacle of a Socialist, Paul Boncour, introducing a military law which pro-

vided for the militarization of the entire nation in the event of war. It would have been difficult to go to further lengths of absurdity, for the law is such that the psychological reactions which it is calculated to arouse would send everything, army and production and all, sky-high. It needed a Socialist to bring forward such a Bill, the very negation of the spirit of the producers. This shows the extent to which people's minds are dominated by the military state, which has endured under one democratic label or another.

IV

The diplomacy of the state has remained that of the military state: nothing could be more entirely contrary to the philosophy of the producer. It would be difficult to find an anachronism more stupid than our diplomacy, which deliberately sets out to make things as difficult as possible for the foreigner. Most diplomacies are in agreement with this conception of their task. After the war the diplomacy of the extreme nationalists was held in high regard in Paris as having invested with high intellectual prestige those old principles of diplomacy according to which if one wanted to be powerful one must humble one's neighbour. Machiavelli was once more regarded as a genius ;

Signor Mussolini represented him as his master. In short, between 1920 and 1930 the traditional diplomacy was all in fashion. Anyone who demonstrated that the peace and the greatness of France required the cutting up of the Germanies, the decomposition of Russia, and every possible trouble for the enemies of French militarism, was regarded as a man of intelligence.

That conception had its justification in the time of the military state, the time when a state was a military organization and could have no security unless there was no military force in its neighbourhood which could venture to threaten it. In our own time this conception is not only immoral but stupid. The power of a state does not proceed from the impotence of its neighbour but from its own power of production. It is imbecile for a state to devote to making trouble for its neighbour any part of the force which it can employ in its own development. Moreover, the moment a world economic system is formed in which nations and continents work in co-operation, Machiavellianism becomes an entire absurdity.

It is as such that it stands revealed in 1931, the first year of the world crisis which has come through the inability of states to get out of the traditional rut of diplomacy. After ten years of mistakes, the producers of the whole world are

suddenly discovering that their prosperity is bound up with that of those whom they had been in the habit of calling their enemies. They are beginning to regard not only as useless but as harmful those writers and diplomats who have been launched into the world as disciples of Machiavelli by paralytic Chancelleries in order to make trouble for their neighbours. It is beginning to be realized that there are no useful embassies other than those of labour, for which, pending a better system, the network of international economic agreements will be woven which will be the prelude to the permanent world economic conference. The whole of the old diplomacy with its intrigues and its poisons and its luxurious prostitutes must be pushed out of the way.

V

Nothing seems farther removed from the warrior spirit than the modern economic system. Daughter of science, lifted up every second, by the continually growing desire for creation, at an increasing rate towards a power which one can discern at giddy heights, the economic system of our day might be thought the sternest enemy of the destructive spirit of militarism. And this it is *de facto*, but not *de jure*; since, though it is given life by the producers, it is not

in the hands of the producers. The distribution of the profits which come from its factories is made not according to the law of production, but according to the law of property. It is through this that the economy of our day is artificially attached to the law of the sword, which is at the bottom of all rights of territorial ownership. And it is through this that there has formed, even in the midst of societies of producers, a juridical and social conception which carries on under modern economy the most archaic conceptions of the minorities which reign by virtue of the war system.

These minorities saw how, by utilizing the traditional conception of property, they could station themselves, through the thousands of limited companies and banks, at the points through which the profits of the economic system pass, and sequester the bulk of the return produced year by year in increasing measure by science, technique, and method. With this control of enterprises in their hands, they have such resources that they are able to control the states, and consequently so to dispose of the army and the police as to render impossible any protest on the part of the innumerable producers on whom these minorities make absolutely illegitimate levies.

The result has been the formation of a sort of

great capitalist class, made up of heterogeneous elements, survivals from the old aristocratic classes, a hereditary bourgeoisie, actual producers, a class which has come to regard itself as the administrator of the goods produced by Invention and as their proper dispenser. Below it is a class of executants of its orders, relatively well fed but kept on the level of cattle, well cared for and trained to respect the right of property of their masters.

At the moment when I am writing this work, this conception is clashing and clattering down to destruction in the world crisis which has come. The depth is being fathomed of the error of the men who failed to understand that the growth of the new economic system can only be assured by societies made up of a single class, that of the producers, and in which the distribution of profits is made entirely in accordance with the right of the producer.

It should be observed, moreover, that any distribution of profits based on the right of possession re-creates the old right of the warrior and banishes the spirit of production. So soon as men find that the profits of the right of possession are greater than those of the right of production, they seek the path which will bring them to the former without producing. Then intrigue, the exploitation of social relationships,

marriage are made use of against the qualities of the producer. And then, too, as in the United States, there are founded those criminal associations which, by the regular organization of swindling and theft and assassination, create in our societies a new war system, which can exist in a society which recognizes the right of the owner of goods or of securities to live without working, but could not continue in societies in which labour alone confers on the producer the right to consume.

There, again, we shall only obtain the full swing of economic creation when we have destroyed the juridical survivals of the war system in the very heart of production.

VI

I said that I should show that our customs and our very etiquette are based on the war system. I am not paradoxing; I am simply analysing. I want to call attention to the magnitude of the task which we have before us in endeavouring to eliminate war from our societies. Remember that our customs and our code of manners, to which we scarcely give thought, so ingrained are they in our habits, represent a large part of our individual and social life. If we perform the acts comprised in this code of social custom and

etiquette, it is not only from habit but from interest.

Examine, then, the interest which lies at the base of existing etiquette, and you will discover that, reduced to its essential lines, our etiquette is the art of conciliating and winning the favour of the great and powerful, getting a place in their following, sharing in the benefits which they enjoy, and being associated in some manner, materially and morally, in their victory when they gain it!

Spontaneously we are tending towards a new code of manners, in which each will endeavour to give the minimum of annoyance to his neighbour, a code which will be reduced to simple formulæ compatible with the life of the producer. That is the present tendency. But the code of manners still in vogue is that which was constructed for the recognition and entrenchment of a social hierarchy based on the right of conquest.

Our salute is not the salute of equals. It is the act of deference towards force; one uncovers before the triumphant warrior. Our raising of our hat is nothing but the homage to force, and to this day it is not replied to by an act of the same nature. The civilian in saluting uncovers; the soldier replies by a salute which is peculiar to him, and which is regarded as a failure in polite-

ness when it is copied by a civilian. Do not say that these gestures have become meaningless. Far as we are from the age when they were established, they remain symbols of hierarchies based on military domination.

What is our handshake? A gesture of comradeship, brotherhood, human equality? In its origin it is a sign of peace between fighters; one holds out one's right hand (to hold out the left is not polite) because that shows that one is unarmed, the right hand being the hand which holds the weapon when a man is on guard.

The gesture has been extended by imitation to men who are not warriors, but it has retained its original meaning. In principle, in the code of perfect worldly politeness, the handshake is performed only between equals—that is, among men belonging to the dominant minorities—who might fight and are at peace. To refuse the hand remains a sign of war, entailing settlement by arms. One does not shake hands with men who are considered to be members of a subordinate social grade.

Our polite greetings are thus not purely human salutations; they are the gestures by which a hierarchy is recognized, and we have just seen that the military element remains at the top of this hierarchy. And it is through the thousand nuances of this etiquette that, even without

noticing it, the men farthest removed from all forms of militarism continue to render homage to the most archaic forms of military domination. It is not a matter of no consequence, for there are few men who can get away from these habits and keep to the rules of a purely human code of manners.

Lastly, all these acts required by the code of polite manners still in vogue remain entirely foreign to labour. It is a code elaborated in order to render homage to power, and to profit by its favour apart from any right accruing from labour. The acts of social life, copied by countless citizens who do not belong to society in the narrow sense of the word, have as their objective the weaving of a network of relationships between the powerful and their protégés which permits the functioning of a system which increases the power of the former and gives the latter an advancement apart from any service rendered to science or to production. This system still plays an enormous part in our societies, which are encumbered by all its manifestations; it is a parasitism on the plane of the old warrior bands, in which a man drew profit from his devotion to the chief of the band (others would say his suzerain), and not from his aptitude for work.

These examples suffice to show what is at the

bottom of our code of manners, which is nothing but the survival of the system of homage instituted by military feudalism at the time of its installation. It is scarcely necessary to remark that our manners and our etiquette are still under the inspiration of the survivors of the various aristocratic classes, whose names and titles, real or fabricated, are still socially of more importance than the titles earned by the scientific discoveries and inventions of the genius of man.

VII

Above all, culture. Our culture, to which so many men are attached who call themselves and believe themselves to be republicans, democrats, or Socialists, or, it may be, Christians, our culture is an integral part of the war system. It has been organized, built up, invested with life in order to sustain a political, economic, and social edifice in which a minority reaps substantial privileges; but, above all, it has been built up in order to place that whole system under the protection of the war system, and to make the right of conquest sacrosanct. That right had to be so consecrated, so sanctified, so surrounded with intellectual justifications that any possible criticism of it would assume the character of the most frightful sacrilege. It was calculated that the

result would be that none save the irregulars of life's army would dare to lift a hand against this body of culture, to the service of which there had been brought that love, so natural to everyone, of the land and the water and the skies of one's own country, and the respect, so equally natural, for the knowledge acquired by humanity.

It is very difficult to quote a precise definition of culture. In order, therefore, to give more precision to the analysis which I am presenting, I propose to begin with a definition which will permit us to follow up a central idea in the pages which follow. Culture is the body of intellectual means through which the human intelligence is prepared for receiving the knowledge acquired, utilizing it, adding to it, and making it serve the direction of man towards those higher human types which are presented by the various forms of art as models for the mass of humanity.

I do not want to discuss here the methods of formation of culture, or to examine the question whether it is useful or essential that the intellectual means necessary for cultural development shall include the obligatory study of Greek and Latin. But I will say in passing that I think it a very secondary matter and perhaps quite useless to study Greek and Latin for the acquisition of knowledge, the formation of judgment, and the

development of an aptitude for scientific reasoning. I will also point out at once what has been said by many others, that the method which makes of the study of Greek and Latin a cultural necessity results in confining culture to a minority privileged at birth, so attaching the system to the politico-social system which is based on the right of conquest.

But that is not a chance association. There is an organic bond between the war system and the cultural system. We shall see that our culture forms part of the war system, that it is a consecration of it, a sanctification, a justification, a glorification, and that its main purpose is to exalt the sentiments and virtues and passions through which men will follow in their lives the examples of the military heroes, who are presented as superior types of humanity.

We could carry our analysis through a long study of the most varied cultural productions in art and painting and literature. We shall simplify our task by introducing into the discussion the symbol of the Pantheon, from which I shall extract an irrefutable proof of my contention. Like Westminster Abbey, the Pantheon may be considered as one of the high places of Western culture; even more so than the Abbey, for it was devoted to the glorification of great men by the French Revolution, with the dedication *Aux*

grands hommes la patrie reconnaissante ("To her great men, from the grateful mother-country"), and is thus the expression of a great and deliberate cultural effort, freed from the errors of the *Ancien Régime*. No trace will be found in its organization of the influence of a court or ecclesiastical coterie. Moreover, it is a de-consecrated church. It thus represents very well a cultural effort freed from the prejudices and superstitions of the past, which is not the case of Westminster Abbey.

If, then, you examine its decorations, frescoes, statues, reliefs, dating from the nineteenth century, decorations which to this day enjoy general approval, you will discover that the institutions which emerged from the Revolution remained attached, through its culture, to the social system which they were meant to destroy, and remained inextricably bound up with the war system. In the nineteenth century, the first great century of Science, Technique, Labour, and Justice, a century which owes its wealth and its power to new cultural values, the Pantheon, one of the foremost temples of Western culture, presented on its walls or at the base of its columns nothing but images in which are praised and exalted the virtues, the feelings, the passions proper to a world in which the warrior is the greatest human figure.

It is worth while to visit the Pantheon to see the pictures to which I refer. There you will see glorified the Saints—St. Geneviève, St. Louis, St. Joan of Arc—saints of whom you may think what you like, but of whom you will be bound to say, whatever admiration you may have for their human virtues, that they are strangers to science and production. You will see kings—Clovis taking his vow at Tolbiac, Charlemagne at his coronation; kings who produced nothing—and then warriors, La Tour d’Auvergne, the sailors of the *Vengeur*, the Mother-country summoning her men to war, a great cavalcade of riders “on to Glory,” the Generals of the Revolution, the warriors, producing nothing. Then the orators, strangers to production—Mirabeau and the orators and publicists of the Restoration; and finally the ideologues, with a monument to Diderot, and beneath it the inscription “The Encyclopædists preparing the idea of the Revolution”—a whole philosophy of history in itself, putting labour under the reign of the Idea, and shutting out of consideration all the liberating action of labour in itself.

More significant, I think, than all the rest is a monument to the National Convention, expressing or betraying the cultural idea of our regime, its thinkers, its leaders, its artists. Who is glorified by this monument? Around the Republic—a

figure resting on a sword and fasces—are soldiers off to the front and orators with their arms stretched out for the oath to the Republic. The scientists? the engineers? the producers? all the creators of the modern world of which the Revolution was the mother—where are they? What is there to represent creative Thought and Labour in this monument? Precisely nothing, nothing, nothing.

It did not occur to the artist that Labour and Science could be glorified alongside the French Republic. And there was not a single minister to be found who could point out to him the heinousness of the omission. Not a minister and not a deputy; and I believe I am right in saying that I am the first writer and the first producer to protest against all this cultural imagery of the Pantheon, which I here denounce as entirely foreign to the needs of the modern world.

You will observe that this imagery was largely ordered by republican governments, and that it is the imagery that expresses the spirit of the dedication of the edifice; it is through this imagery that the regime which proceeded from the French Revolution shows to the whole world that for itself and its people the highest cultural values are those which serve to form the warrior, and that the scientist and the producer belong to a system which is allowed no place in the

cultural hierarchy represented by the Pantheon.

Beneath this imagery are the tombs. There, Pasteur and Berthelot have found a place—in the basement—but under the protection of the kings, warriors, and orators; and in the nave they have been allowed no representation of the Science which they served.

I know of nothing more significant than this cultural imagery of the Pantheon. It is the sign of the permanence of a culture inherited from an aristocratic world which had its origin in the right of conquest; a culture which places science and labour in the rank of the human activities which have no right of entry into the paradise of glory. It makes understandable the failure of the French Revolution, which destroyed the framework of the world of the past, but allowed the "invisible" values of that world to subsist. The French Revolution was not crowned by a cultural revolution. It was carried through for justice, science, labour; but it allowed the culture which based society on force and on the war system to continue in existence.

To-day we are able to see this clearly. We have to complete the work of the French Revolution, to carry through the cultural revolution. Otherwise, if truth lies with the old culture, let us honour the warrior, and let us give him the opportunity to carry his virtues to their highest

expression: let us deliver over the world to war!

Who would dare to commit that crime to-day? Who does not realize at the bottom of his heart that the warrior has to yield his place to the producer?

If that is the new truth, and it is that that we proclaim, we have to build up the culture of the producer, and to organize our societies on a constitutional system based on production.

THE CULTURE OF THE PRODUCERS

I

Our contention is that the creation and organization of peace require a new culture and institutions founded on a new constitutional system.

We repeat that peace will not be achieved through the good feeling of men who adhere to the valuations of the old culture; it will be achieved with sane men living normally in a cultural, juridical, economic, and social environment that has severed all bonds with the old culture.

Two civilizations are in conflict in the heart of the modern world—the civilization of war and the civilization of work. It is for the latter to cast the culture and institutions of the former into the shades of the dead past.

We have shown how all our existing institutions rest on the constitutional system based on war, and how the essential purpose of the old culture is the exaltation of the human virtues which make of man a warrior. I leave it to others to discover whether there is anything good to be

saved from the world which is crumbling. People are very ready to this day to find a neat intellectual subtlety and almost an act of historic justice in the praising of certain successful resorts to force in the past. That seems to me to be a bad method, for in that way we should admit into the new culture valuations which would corrupt it. Historic whitewashings almost always aim at permitting the preservation of some injustice which it is desired to transform into a social benefit because it dates back into the past. Several historical schools have expended a great deal of effort in the demonstration that if monarchy and the feudal system are no longer of any service, they had their usefulness in the past. For half a century the French Academy has been crowning works which made much of the function of protectors performed by the feudal knights. The preoccupation with such arguments comes from the desire to show that history has always had good reason for producing this or that development at this or that moment. But it must be added that these graciousnesses enabled the Academy to deal gently with its dukes, whose criminal origins it would have been uncomfortable to have had to expose.

That is why ingenious historic theories have been constructed according to which the feudal system was apparently founded not by a pack

of brigands and murderers, debauchees and pillagers, but by decent people who dedicated themselves to the mission of protecting poor merchants as they travelled along unsafe roads and honest artisans who trembled within the walls of their cities. These ingenious theories aim above all at the preservation of the existing privileges of the old families that still find employment in the army, in diplomacy, and on the boards of the great financial companies.

Other theories set out to prove that it was necessary to combat the brutality of our ancestors by brutal methods. These theories have not the purpose of those just mentioned, of bolstering up the existing privileges of old families; they aim principally at enabling a certain number of politicians to practise the moderation and manipulation and participation and other activities through which one may cheat the present day of its due.

No doubt it is very difficult to take up an attitude of radical opposition to the war system, since that makes academic and fashionable and even ordinary social relations very strained, if not impossible. But we have to apply here the rigorous scientific method, and act as the chemist does, not wasting a single moment in speculation on whether the conclusions that his retorts indicate will assist his wife in her social duties or get

his children married off. We have to treat the past and the present on the principle of the chemist and the physician!

That being so, we need devote no more attention to the question whether history was right or wrong in producing feudalism, monarchy, wars, and so on. We simply know that she did produce them, and that the kings and princes and nobles who founded these regimes and carried on these wars were, as a rule, unmitigated bandits, and that their methods of action were murder and robbery and pillage.

It is, no doubt, difficult to publish historic conclusions of that sort in the face of a world in which there still reign illustrious royal families whose fortune is based on enormous massacres of men of every colour, or aristocracies or bourgeoisies which, after wresting the state from the old dynasties, acquired national estates or immense cotton fields or limitless prairies or inexhaustible mines in the course of ousting sultans or deys or beys or rajahs or maharajahs whom they charged with having offended against the laws of civilized society. It is understandable that it should have required immense intellectual efforts to transform this monstrous system of murder and pillage, through the artifice of culture, into a great system and an heroic one. And it is easy to understand that it will be no

small task to demolish this cultural edifice, which has the support of all the official institutions and of a whole social system. But, after all, one must stand either for or against the truth. And truth requires that one should give the old culture its true name and define its real function. It is the culture through which, in the name and for the advantage of age-long parasitic dominations, there is transformed into heroism what is simply and purely the aptitude for murder and pillage.

II

On what are we to base the new culture?

The first thing is to avoid repeating ancient errors. The old culture was founded in every country by the same process: a fighting minority imbued itself with an ideology of which the symbols became those of the group, and then made it an instrument of its reign. Or else, minorities took over the ideas and sentiments of a great popular movement, and preserved its symbolic phrases while profoundly modifying their sense with the aid of the minorities' ideologies. That happened not only in Europe but in China and the Indies, under the most varied labels.

In Europe the aristocracies found ways and means of making Christianity serve their in-

terests. It was a truly difficult operation, for Christianity was originally a system of valuations radically opposed to the war system. In the course of centuries, the aristocracies found means of making it into an instrument of their reign, and even a means of sending armies into battle. Before the world war it was very difficult for us to comprehend the psychological mechanism of these feats of paradox. It became much easier after seeing numbers of soldiers in each camp take the symbols of religion for its essence, and regard themselves as good and faithful members of such and such a religion while living a disorderly life, so long as they pinned on their overcoats the medals or insignia of their faith.

And not only did we see that, but we saw what might have been supposed to be absolutely irreconcilable with militarism become the foundation of a new militarism. We saw the *Internationale*, an essentially anti-militarist song, become the official marching-song of the Red Army. That, perhaps, is going even farther than using Christianity to bolster up war. It enables one to understand how Christian civilization, which ought to have been one of the civilizations of labour and peace, has been able to become a civilization of fighters, who cut one another's throats century after century under the sign of the Cross. If we were not careful, we should see

the development in Europe of a Socialist civilization in which, within a quarter of a century, the peoples would be engaged in mutual destruction by means of poison-gas and microbes, under the sign of the Red Flag.

These astonishing *volte-face* are based on man's extraordinary ability to take the symbol for the thing symbolized, a faculty which permits every possible form of deception. But deception is facilitated above all by the ideological method, which enables aristocracies and minorities of every sort to assume power over groups of men through the interpretation of ideas, and to set men against one another by means of opposing ideologies in which everything is distorted.

Every ideological movement is destined irrevocably to elude the control of the producers. The moment it becomes necessary to consult specialists in ideas in order to know whether one has hold of the truth, one inevitably places the direction of a movement in the hands of ideologues, and one makes of it a sect-factory; this is equally true of Christianity and of Socialism. And the sects tend to ruin one another by force. In the course of time we should be in danger of seeing within the world body of Socialism the growth of reformist states and unitary states and all sorts of others, which would go to war with one another.

That is the rock to be avoided. But on what can we base a culture?

III

Georges Sorel, my master, to whom I render homage once more, and whom we understand much better to-day than while he was living, Georges Sorel pointed to the solution in his work, which was the first attempt at a philosophy of the proletarian movement.

Sorel is one of the writers who have shown us most forcibly how to escape from the dangers of the ideological method. Sorel, whose intellectual influence will go on extending unceasingly, did not put into circulation any Sorellist ideas. Like Marx, he instituted a method of working. He considered that the true values, the living, dynamic values proceed from the actual course of events, and take intellectual form in life itself, through the impact of developments on the intelligence. He showed that the task of the intellectual is to precipitate these values from popular movements, and to help to make them visible and thinkable for those who are actually experiencing them. Sorel accordingly tried to isolate from the proletarian movement the values which give it life; and it was in this way that he was able to announce that there is being formed a moral system based on production.

Following Sorel's example, I am not attempting to introduce here a particular set of ideas, I am not submitting any Valoisian ideas; I am analysing modern life, and the moment that I have recognized that the warrior and the producer are in conflict, and that peace can only come through the triumph of the producer, I arrive at the conclusion that the culture of the warrior must give place to the culture of the producer.

But is the culture of the producer an invention of the intelligence, or a phenomenon in course of development, a growing body of valuations? Is it a vital reality which is on the threshold of life and is crying out to be born? We declare that it is a reality, a great and universal reality. A new culture is in process of formation which may be called the culture of the producers, and which will be the soul of the juridical and social system which will completely eliminate the right of conquest and will base all its institutions on the rights of the producer.

IV

What is the culture of the producer? To define it, to distinguish it in a world in which it has already penetrated deeply, it is necessary to regard the other cultures. Under the names

Greco-Latin, Arab, Hindu, it is easy to distinguish two great cultural systems, one aristocratic, the other bourgeois, both with the same characteristics. There is an aristocratic culture which exalts the virtues, the passions, and the means of action of the man who bases his power on domination. It makes of art a distraction for the dominator in his leisure, and of science a means of multiplying his means of domination. There is a bourgeois culture, a culture of lawyers and merchants, which exalts the virtues, the passions, and the means of action of the man who lays the foundation of his property, his prosperity, and increases them by means of inheritance, marriage, social relationships, or legal claims, and for whom art is a means of psychological confirmation of his position, and science a means of increasing his wealth.

Those are two easily recognized cultures, furnishing two men of different type. For the aristocratic culture the highest type of humanity is the warrior; for the bourgeois culture it is the owner of property who employs and increases his property by prudence and economy and all the elements of wise administration. There was a moment, in 1789, when these two cultures stood violently opposed to one another. The bourgeois culture triumphed; then it assimilated the aristocratic culture, associating the warrior with the

proprietor and assigning to them virtually equal rank.

In the twentieth century these two cultures have tended to fuse into one, in which bourgeois values greatly outweigh aristocratic values, and the warrior is placed on the same plane as the proprietor. There are still two tendencies, one predominantly aristocratic, the other predominantly bourgeois, but the two cultures virtually form a single one in which force is placed in the service of an abstraction called Right, which expresses the right to direction demanded by the bourgeoisie, a right which it draws from its culture. This culture constitutes definitely the right of direction in society. It is only acquired if one has possessions—that is, if one has the means *of not working* for the period of years necessary to enable the knowledge and the judgments of value to be acquired which constitute culture. The peculiar feature of this culture is that, although it is the culture of a minority, it is exceptionally accessible to men outside the minority; on condition, however, that they accept its values—that is, admit that human societies have necessarily to be directed by a cultivated minority and that the right to culture is acquired by the possession of money.

To sum up, in a world in which wealth is

based on science, invention, and labour, or, in one word, on *Labour*, the labour of the whole being, the dominant culture continues to be based on force; for if the bourgeois conception of right is superposed on the aristocratic conception of force, the basis of culture remains in fact simply force.

It is easy, however, to see why specifically bourgeois values are expressed with difficulty by the various forms of art. The figure of the warrior appeals to the painter and the sculptor; but scarcely that of the banker. Besides, in literature, in law, in sociology the bourgeois culture may put the proprietor, the possessor of money, in the front rank, but it will never venture to hold up the banker to popular admiration. It will not replace the warrior's heroism, in its commemorations in the Pantheon, by the banker's! On the other hand, it is impossible for it to glorify the scientist, the engineer, the producer properly so called, for it would be obliged to recognize their high functions in modern life. It prefers to give prominence to warlike figures, which are much less to be feared, for in almost every country the soldiers have abdicated to the masters of money; the force which they represent is subordinate, though it remains the pivot of the structure, without which it would rapidly collapse. Which enables us to conclude that the

aristocratic and bourgeois culture rests definitely on Force.

We may say definitely that the culture of the producer is not being formed either in aristocratic or in bourgeois society. But are there other places in which it is being formed? Are there other places than drawing-rooms and country houses and editorial offices in which a culture can form?

There is one, and one only. It is the workshop, the word being taken as including every place in which effective work is going on, from the laboratory to the cornfield. It is there that a culture is being elaborated, a culture to-day called proletarian, born in the hardships of daily labour, and exalting the virtues, the passions, the means of action of the man who owes everything to labour, science, and technique, for whom art is the exaltation of the creative power of the intelligence, and science the means of liberating humanity from material servitudes and of incessantly intellectualizing man's efforts.

It has been agreed to call the culture which is forming in the workshop proletarian. It is not that it is specifically proletarian, but it is in proletarian quarters that it is forming most strongly. The valuations of proletarian culture are frequently those of men belonging to the bourgeoisie, but actually working, who attach

more importance to their function of producers than to their claims as owners. Similarly, bourgeois valuations are falling within the bourgeoisie itself, since, being formed in a world of owners who make their property remunerative through their administration, they are unsuited to the dynamic qualities needed by the person who is the driving force of a factory, and so a creator, a man necessarily in search every moment of technical progress and of the best output, which require an incessantly renewed effort of organization.

For all that, the culture of labour, of the producer, is being formed much more in proletarian society than among producers who come from the bourgeoisie; for these latter, through their family ties and their origin and their social relationships, are bound to be influenced by the valuations of bourgeois culture which have been instilled into them, and with which they remain in daily contact. It is as difficult for them to detach themselves from bourgeois culture as it was for the nobles of the *Ancien Régime* to detach themselves from aristocratic culture. Experience shows that at certain moments, under the influence of the general trend, the dominant class itself abandons its cultural positions. But that is not, as has often been stated, the effect of propaganda; it is the result of the social transforma-

tion. In our own day numbers of bourgeois are becoming producers, taking up posts not in virtue of their title as owners, but in virtue of their personal qualities, their competence. It is that fact that leads them to think as producers, and to oppose the judgments of value of the producer to those of the owner.

Little by little, the producers' valuations are spreading considerably. And in face of the proletarian wave which is sending men into directing posts, and which is acting directly on the grand scale throughout the economic system, all those who have a place in the world's work are being led to base their titles to direction on their work and not on their ownership. Thus the new values are being elaborated and reinforced; all the more quickly since the proletariat is thinking out its own movement with increasing rapidity, either collectively or through the men who take possession of directing posts.

As all the modern machinery develops, with its needs of general staffs and of countless technicians, the proletariat is producing enormous batches of executive workers who can no more be incorporated by the bourgeoisie than the bourgeois in their time could be by the nobility. A sort of new class is forming, composed of men of bourgeois or proletarian origin, in which the latter considerably outnumber the former, a class

which is neither bourgeois nor proletarian and is to-day the nucleus of the society of producers which is in process of formation. The aristocratic and bourgeois minorities are making great efforts to incorporate this class and to induce it to recognize the preeminence of the old culture. Their efforts are succeeding less and less. The producer of proletarian origin is no more disposed to call himself bourgeois than the true bourgeois was to call himself noble; first, because that would be like treason to the parents who brought him up; secondly, because the producer only wants to owe his rank to his work; thirdly, because the life of the producer is irreconcilable with society life, the futility of which is profoundly despised by every man who works.

On the other hand, it is very natural that the culture of labour should form in the proletariat. No one is likelier than the proletarian, who was formerly under the domination of the sword and then for a century under that of money, to repudiate in the name of labour the power of the sword or the power of money. A class which possesses only its power of working, intellectually or manually, is bound to base its greatness on labour and nothing but labour. That is why the valuations necessary to a society based on work are being elaborated most strongly among the proletariat.

I will mention my own experience. I was of proletarian origin, and lived twenty years in the heart of the proletariat, gaining practical personal acquaintance with the proletarian workshop and the life of the proletarian student or the proletarian office worker. For a long time, however, I have no longer belonged to the proletariat, owing to the directive functions which I have been performing for twenty years past. But I have never entered the bourgeoisie, and I do not want to enter it; I am continuing to live under valuations which are specifically proletarian. After an experience of twenty years in practical business, I consider that the proletarian valuations are those best suited to form the values necessary to a society of producers.

That is why, so far as war is concerned, and the elaboration of the culture which will oust the warrior's culture, I am able to conclude that the proletarian culture is that which, quantitatively and qualitatively, will bring the strongest reinforcement to labour in its opposition to war. I want to point out again that it is not a question of a movement started by the ideas of this or that man, but of a movement proceeding from the daily life of a class which sets work against war in the simple act of living, a class which to-day has become capable of thinking out its life.

I conclude that it is the proletarian classes who will furnish the main dynamic of the culture of the producers in the task of repelling the culture of the warrior age.

V

In the culture of the producers, the only human figure is that of the man who works. Anyone who does not work is outside the pale of humanity. The man who kills is a criminal. Those who organize war are the enemies of humanity.

The right of citizenship belongs only to the man who works. One activity alone is noble, work. Glory means the capture of a force from nature and its subjection to the service of man. Knowledge, reason, judgment form in the course of work. Each one is free to seek the cause or causes by the method that appeals to him; but human morality will proceed from work and its necessities.

There is no better school than mechanical work for preparing man for respect for truth. Labour lends no support to lies. Social life under the old culture was a school of lying and trickery. The workshop is the school of truth. One may make servants lie; one cannot make a motor lie.

The workshop is the school of justice. Social life is the sphere in which false reputations are

made by every device of intrigue. The workshop is the sphere in which the output of each is easily controlled.

The workshop is the school of honesty. The social life of the old culture is the scene of make-believe and "keeping up appearances." In the machine the hidden flaw kills its man.

The workshop is the school of accepted discipline. In the world of the past discipline comes from the constraint applied by man to man. In the workshop it proceeds from labour; the yield depends on the regulation of labour.

The workshop is the school of real progress. Amid the artifices of the old culture, progress is always under discussion. There are interminable palavers as to what is and what is not progress, and never a clear decision. In the workshop, progress is actively sought by all. Each one is out to save useless exertion. Progress is any improvement which effects a saving of human effort.

The workshop is the place where every human feeling and every passion is sincere. The old culture filled the palaces and the places in which men did no work with high-flown sentiments. It is in labour that love is natural and free and strong. Sincerity is the breath of its life. When no one can live except by labour, there is no longer any room for ignoble pretence, cupidity masking under the show of love; there is no

longer room for the prostitution of man or woman.

The workshop is the birthplace of beauty—not the beauty evoked by the fantastic caprice of the idlers and dilettantes, but that of harmony of material with its natural potentialities, and its adaptation to its purpose.

The workshop is the school of knowledge. Anyone who makes a mistake in regard to his material, its composition or its resistance, will be punished in the result of his labour. An error of judgment means a broken tool. A miscalculation may destroy a machine.

Thus the workshop is the place where there are formed, sanely, surely, all the values of culture, without the interminable palaver and the endless discussion of the ideology-brewers.

Finally, the workshop is the place in which man enters into the knowledge of value itself. He sees value in growth, brings it to birth—without talking about it. Philosophies may spend years and ages in the discussion of value. In the workshop, value is anything that is useful to man in the maintenance of life; it is the product of labour well conceived, well organized, well executed. The thing that is good is labour; the thing that is evil is idleness, which means wasted material and tools, means destruction, means war.

So it is that there comes from the workshop, where judgments of value are elaborated, and passed on thereafter as ideas and appreciations and assessments through the whole of social life, there comes from the workshop the condemnation of war, unequivocally, in the name of the culture that is formed by labour.

THE TASK OF REVOLUTION

I

I am not addressing myself either to the specialist in the chimerical or to the utopist, but to the practical, realist man, and especially to the man who has come to regard the organization of peace as a dream, and revolution as a mad adventure or even the essence of evil. It is to the man of this type that I say that we must organize revolution in cold blood in order to achieve peace. We must organize the revolution of peace in order to be master of the event, and to escape from the revolution of war, of which none can foretell the issue, save that it would be a terrible retrogression and the end of peace, perhaps for centuries.

Are you no less afraid of revolution than of war? Do you want to have neither the one nor the other? Then you will have both. With our existing cultural, economic, and social system, we are making headlong for war, with no possibility of applying the brakes. And war will mean revolution; or, more precisely, a general rising, a refusal to serve, and appalling social con-

fusion. No one can foresee what will be the outcome of that confusion. I do not think I need dwell for a moment on that. The men farthest removed from Socialism or Communism or any revolutionary doctrine, men belonging to the intelligent section of neo-capitalism, are convinced that war would give the signal for a catastrophic general revolution.

Moscow alone regards without dislike the prospect of a continental war. We have seen Muscovite Communism fail throughout Europe, our continent has suffered, since the war, the most acute financial and economic crises, and yet has escaped a development which would have been intelligible in face of the continued impotence of governments. This set-back to Communism does not proceed at all from the horror felt by Europeans for Bolshevism. There is no deep and general antipathy to Moscow; there is even strong sympathy in many quarters, and Europe is following the Russian experiment with passionate interest. But she has no belief in the ability of the Muscovite general staffs to take in hand the direction of the European economic system. Even the Socialists and Communists of Europe consider that, while Muscovite Communism has succeeded, through unprecedented difficulties and on the brink of the abyss, in regaining the direction of an elementary eco-

conomic system, it would be absolutely powerless to assure the continuance of the European economy, with its extraordinary complexities, except by running mortal risks.

Moscow knows perfectly well that it is unable to penetrate this European mass, full as it is of sympathy for her, though determined for all that to remain independent of her guidance. But she also knows that in one event, one single event, the masses in Europe would join up at once with the Third International—in the event of war. They would no longer have any choice. Faced with the peril of death amid a general insurrection, they would, beyond any doubt, prefer to take the one chance of safety open to them, through adhesion to a revolution which has already been organized. Would the leaders in Moscow be in a position then to dominate events and assure the direction of the European economy? I do not think so; their experience in Russia, though it gives them a clear superiority to Tsarism, is not yet conclusive, and gives them no sufficient title to become the leaders of the Western economic system.

In these conditions the choice is restricted for all of us. The choice is not even between war and revolution; it is between destructive revolution and constructive revolution. He who wants peace must organize revolution. And a total

revolution—cultural, political, economic, social, international.

We have now reached the point at which practical proposals must be put before the reader. I will not conceal from him that it was by deliberate design that from the beginning of this work up to this point I formulated no considerations in regard to practical action. They might have stimulated the imagination, but they would have been premature.

II

It is not impossible to suppose that we organizers of peace might attain power without any great disturbance. Events are going to summon us to power, as a result of the absolute impotence of all the governments based on the old principles.

We are approaching the moment when they will fall almost of their own accord amid the general crises which are overwhelming them. It will be understood why I am rigorously refraining here from giving any indication of the means to be employed in the event of one or more governments refusing to abandon power, or forming some sort of dictatorship. I am supposing, and with very good reason, that in some of the great European countries the partisans of peace are carried into power. In France, for

example, I hold that a bold group, placing itself at the head of the movement, could carry with it all the republican groups, which would be carried into power by an irresistible current, even by the simple play of the elections. That was witnessed in 1924. It may be witnessed again, on a much larger scale, and without the coalition going to pieces in six months. But that is another matter, to which we shall return.

Suppose, then, that a republican government, pacifist and realist, is in power. What will it do? Suppose that we, the partisans of peace, are the government. What must we do in order to found peace?

We must at once abandon the war system. Consequently, we can have neither the New Army of Jaurès nor the Red Army of Trotzky. There must be no more Jacobin or capitalist militarism, and not even a Socialist militarism. Militarism itself must be suppressed. In plain language, that means the suppression of the Ministry of War and of the army. And that is the solution at which we must arrive if we are to get anything useful done. Naturally, that is only part of a general scheme which I am about to indicate. But I felt bound to say straight out at the outset what must be our objective, so that we may know where we stand.

It will be realized, of course, that I do not for

one moment imagine that the whole world will copy us. And, once our army is disbanded, I imagine that one or two or three of our neighbours will be prepared to fall upon us; I will add that one or two or three of our neighbours might be perfectly capable of sending their armies against us. For if, as things stand at present, all our comrades across the frontier regard war with the same disgust as we do, they would regard an operation against us as quite interesting if they were told that we should send no army against them. Pillage with no risk of death is fine fun. Rest assured that among some of our neighbours there would be plenty of volunteers to be had for that operation. And there would be just as many in our own country to be had for a pillaging expedition, if it carried no risk, into Germany or the plains of Italy.

On the other hand, if the army was suppressed, our own bellicists would form one within the country, and would set up a dictatorship. I conclude, therefore, that the suppression of the army, which is a necessity, at once brings dictatorship and war.

We have thus to take account of the fact that to-day, and for a long time yet, we shall find among us and abroad warlike forces which would profit by the suppression of our army to bring war back. Consequently, in suppressing

the army, we must have in our hands a force utilizable against all the bellicists. We are bound to have it; it is indispensable. But, instead of organizing it in the form of an army, on the heroic plane, we shall organize it as a social and an international service, on the scientific, hygienic, industrial plane.

We regard bellicism as a malady, at home and abroad, and we shall proceed to treat it by appropriate measures. Having suppressed the Ministry of War, we shall organize a Ministry of Peace, which we shall do better to call a Ministry of International Hygiene. Its mission will be to render impossible, by every effective means, any invasion of our territory by an army and any attempt at the formation of bands in our own territory.

At the head of the Ministry we shall not put soldiers; we shall put scientists, engineers, organizers, directors of great enterprises. Their mission will be to discover all the chemical, mechanical, and other means by which any forces mobilized against us will be destroyed, and destroyed without heroism, exactly as noxious insects are destroyed. Naturally, every necessary financial provision will be made for the manufacture of the special material required.

In other words, we shall prepare a force capable of turning back an invasion or disposing

of an armed insurrection. But you will observe that the essential thing is not to employ military means—that is, not to mobilize men for heroic service. We shall allow no element of glory in this sanitary service; it will be no more glorious than the fight with locusts. It will be sanitation, not heroism.

That is the principal problem to be solved. If the struggle against the war system had to be conducted by military means, everything would begin over again. It would be necessary to set on foot an anti-militarist army, but an army for all that, the soldiers of which would be trained specially for murder and in their quality of potential murderers would be invested with the glamour of heroism. This army would be subject to the discipline special to armies, whether White or Red; and as it would constitute a dangerous force within the country, it would have to be kept under surveillance, and the state would have to be organized dictatorially to prevent the army from seizing control of it. That is the recent experience of the Soviet Republic, which had before it the disturbing history of the French Revolution and its liquidation by imperial neo-militarism. So far, the Soviet Republic has escaped Bonapartism, but it remains dictatorial in form, and it is developing its militarism. In every way the old state is

being reconstituted. In the U.S.S.R. the Red Army lives like all other armies; there is cultivated in it a proletarian heroism which necessarily takes the same form as any other military heroism.

Proletarian heroism will necessarily serve as the basis of a proletarian militarism, which will be of exactly the same nature as any other militarism. The means have thus to be found of routing bellicisms by other than military means. That is why we propose the constitution of a Ministry of International Hygiene, with the mission which we described above.

But, of course, our Ministry of Peace will not confine itself to awaiting the attacks of bellicisms: it will create organs charged with the task of disintegrating all war systems, at home and abroad. It will organize active collaboration with all builders of peace, first in Europe and subsequently in the other continents. For allies it will have the producers of the whole world, for adversaries the warmongers. In friendly cooperation with the producers it will work towards the disintegration of the military organizations—openly. Needless to say, this will set it in opposition with every government based on the war system; it could not be otherwise. We are proclaiming the new constitutional system; we reject the constitutional system

based on war. We shall have against us all who recognize it. Between ourselves and the warrior states there will be the same struggle as between Revolutionary France and monarchical Europe. But we shall have to take care that the struggle does not take the form of war. It will have to be scientific, technical, mechanical, economic, cultural. We shall, therefore, organize for the routing of an invasion by all the means which our chemists, our engineers, our electrical experts provide for us, and for the dissolution of all militarisms by concerted action in all countries with associations of producers.

Having suppressed the army, we have a moral advantage in the eyes of other peoples which no one has to-day. Moscow, mistress of a powerful army, is ill-fitted for talking of peace in Europe. When she entered into direct conflict with Europe, launching against Poland what looked like the advance guard of a formidable and aggressive militarism, she lost at once half of the sympathy which had been extended to her.

As for the struggle with the governments based on the war system, it is necessary and inevitable. The new state and the old state cannot coexist. War must be eliminated not only from Europe, but from the whole world. I do not suggest that that will be achieved in a few weeks or even a few years. What I do say is

that, as soon as we have the power in our hands, we must be resolutely prepared for the struggle and for pursuing it until we have done our work. Otherwise it is absolutely useless to attempt it or to speak to-day of peace.

Let us be assured, then, that we shall enter into conflict from the outset with the bellicist governments. Do you say that these governments will go baldly, there and then, to war with us? I am quite sure that they would like to! But as to its practicability, I am not so sure. Obviously, they would have no difficulty in discovering a pretext. But I do not believe that any government will actually try to go to war against a state which represents itself to all peoples as a builder of peace, suppressing its military institutions and retaining only a chemical and mechanical defence such as I have indicated. Bear in mind that at this day the European states would have been very glad to go to war against the U.S.S.R., but dare not, so well aware are they of the risks they would run, especially at home. And yet, in view of the powerful army of the Soviet Union, it is relatively easy to represent it as a power pacific only in pretence. Nevertheless, no state ventures on a frontal attack, and it seems to-day that Europe is giving up entirely any idea of a crusade against the Soviets.

Our state will represent a much more difficult problem to the bellicist governments than the U.S.S.R. To begin with, we are producers, and among the most skilled of the whole world. We take front rank in the intellectual world. We are not regarded as madmen. We are the most well-balanced people in the world. We are reasonable, rationalists, rationalizers. Only one form of struggle with us is possible—the effort to bring disunity among us; the thousand forms of intrigue which aim at setting one group against another. If we were to remain passive in face of the bellicist governments, we should be lost. Carrying on a vigorous offensive, we shall win the day. It is for us to announce to all the world that, in accord with all men of good will, we are out to build up peace. It is for us to work for the formation in the bellicist countries of groups of producers who later on will give their country a government of producers. It is for us to mobilize our writers, our press, our publishers, to spread all over the world the most formidable cultural propaganda that has ever been organized against war.

The consequence might very likely be the breaking off of diplomatic relations with us. I must even add that that is desirable. There must be an out-and-out fight between the old society and the new. There must be no compromise.

The new must destroy the old. And the rupture is necessary because the new constitutional principle has to be laid down which withdraws from every state the right to make war.

That involves the suppression of what is called the sovereignty of states. This sovereignty has no meaning outside the constitutional system based on war. It becomes meaningless the moment we abandon that system.

The bellicist states cannot possibly accept that principle. Thus, a diplomatic rupture with them is inevitable. Subsequently, we shall have to try to secure recognition by one or another of the old states.

It is we, the states of the new world, who will have to proclaim everywhere the sovereign force of the new legal system. We recognize no right of making war for anyone, just as we recognize no right of any citizen or association of citizens to kill. We treat states as individuals. It is we who will not grant recognition to states which want to retain their right of going to war.

III

The new organization implies for the peoples a cultural and linguistic independence. The imperialists and militarists compelled peoples to adopt the language of the conqueror. That was

a means of subjection, for it restricts, retards, even temporarily arrests the development of a people. Man does not think well, does not assimilate new ideas well, unless all the intellectual operations which he has to perform are performed in his own language. The psychological reasons why this must be so may be visualized by analogy with the physiological reasons which make it difficult for a people to assimilate easily plant and animal juices which have not been prepared by the particular culinary methods to which they are used. Physiologically, culture, knowledge is not effectively assimilable by an ethnic group except through its own linguistic means.

It is a mistake to imagine that science and culture can be conveyed to ethnic groups in a language foreign to them. Culture and science have to be instilled by an enrichment of the language. It is excellent for the minds best adapted to intellectual gymnastics to have a familiarity with several languages; but the instilling of modern culture must be effected through each man's own language.

We have, therefore, to proclaim the cultural and linguistic independence of all peoples. No one has a right to impose a language by force or by superiority of numbers. Everyone is free to belong to the linguistic or cultural group which

he declares to be his own. Everyone is equally free to choose whatever second language suits him for his international communications. There are three or half a dozen recognized international languages. In the countries in which various ethnic groups live alongside one another, the groups must agree among themselves as to the choice of a second language, to be taken from the group of international languages.

Cultural liberty is complete. It applies to every form of thought. The state is a state of producers, founded for the necessities of labour, and declares itself incompetent to interfere in metaphysics of any sort. It leaves its citizens free to associate themselves, at their own expense and risk, with any metaphysical or religious group whose activities are foreign to production. The state does not recognize any right of any such association to put pressure in any manner whatever on the producers to make them submit their acts to considerations foreign to production.

IV

The new state presents itself as an organ charged with the coordination of human activities for the realization of human progress—that is to say, for the increase of the material protection of human life on the planet, the diminution of

muscular effort, the intellectualization of man's effort, the increase of his output, and the valorization of his intelligence; furthermore, for the exploitation by rational methods and to the best profit to humanity of all the resources of the world, and, finally, for the increase and constant diffusion of the rational and scientific knowledge acquired and verified by man. We base all the institutions of the new state on the needs of labour and of scientific research.

So far as regards our present objective, the elimination of war, the mission of the state, after achieving the security to which we have referred, is to assure to the peace-building nation or group a decisive economic superiority. The warrior state makes an enormous levy on production for war preparation, and in time of war it subordinates everything else to war. The state of the producers, once the conflict begins, wins the game by carrying production to the highest possible point.

The state becomes the brain of the general economic system. Only producers take part in the formation of the state; the state is no longer based on opinions; it is based on labour. The producers qualify as such when they are admitted to a union embracing men who accomplish a task which is recognized as useful to the collectivity. The trade unions recognize one

another. They are the pillars of the strength of the community. They are the only elements of power. They represent that which makes the power of man in nature, the labour through which man captures for his profit the energy contained in nature. We give two representations to each citizen-producer: one general, corresponding to his general function of worker, and through which he will go to constitute the state; the other special, corresponding to his special function in the economic system, and through which he will go to constitute the syndical organisms, local and regional—the cells of the economic body—which will be federated, and will lead up through their federations to the state.

With these institutions we shall work for the immediate rational exploitation of the brains of man and the soil of the earth. In the conflict between ourselves and the bellicist states, we shall need first to become economically the stronger, and then to become psychologically the stronger, for our economic strength must serve us by increasing our power of disintegrating the bellicism of our adversaries.

The school becomes for us the means of preparation for economic life. The whole of the school period will be devoted to the formation of the producer. To-day a good third of that

period is taken up with military preparation. Enormous intellectual pressure is, in fact, applied from the moment the child enters school, through history, geography, and moral and civic instruction, to his preparation for military service and for the heroism of the soldier who dies to fill the pockets of the war profiteer. We shall devote that whole period to the formation of the producer. The value of our young men to the economic life of the country at the moment of their entry into employment will be at least thirty per cent. greater. The school system will necessarily be changed from top to bottom. There will be only one type of education, through which every child will pass, without distinction of birth: to pass through its stages on the strength of work done and not of financial resources. A systematic search will be carried on for every creative brain, not to enrol it among the academic literati, as to-day, but to assign it to one or another of the various techniques of production. We shall not abandon the talent or genius born in obscurity to the chances of life, to swim or sink. We shall be constantly on the alert to make the best use of our human material.

There will, of course, be a systematic development of the sciences. The sums at present swallowed up by the army will be applied very largely to scientific work, in the service partly of

security and partly of production. The modern world, which owes its fortune to science, has not yet been capable of setting up laboratories worthy of the scientific workers who have freely given immense fortunes to all countries. We have to create a network of laboratories, both for the development of the pure sciences and for the systematic study of regional resources. All this work should be done in cooperation with the trade unions concerned.

At every stage the school will be in close touch with the unions of producers which are to benefit from its work, and this from the commune upwards to the topmost summits of the collective life.

Thus we shall prepare for the economic system the best technicians and the best inventors.

V

The state is the organ of the general coordination of the economic system. We foresee that, later on, a world economic conference will regulate the distribution of raw material and, later still, production itself. We begin to-day with our own state or group of states, and we give ourselves a method of working and a general directive.

The military states had an economic policy of

extreme simplicity: their financial and bourgeois aristocracies sent soldiers to conquer territories containing raw materials, had these materials transported to Europe, transformed them into manufactured products, and then sent these into the conquered territories. On that system the European economic system has subsisted for a century. I have said that this system will no longer endure. From the moment when we repudiate war, the system will collapse. It will collapse also because China, Japan, and the Indies will henceforth utilize their own raw materials in their own industry. The old European economic system is doomed; that is, indeed, apparent from the crisis which started in 1930. It must be replaced by a new system. The only possible system is the exploitation of Europe itself. Instead of seeking customers in the Indies or China for the output of the European factories, the consuming capacity of the industrial and agricultural workers of Europe must be increased; and this entails increasing the productive capacity of both, and particularly of the rural workers. The general directive given by the state must be the rational exploitation of Europe.

It is absurd to regard Europe as economically an old country. It is a continent only on the threshold of its exploitation. Not only are im-

mense stretches still awaiting opening up in the Danubian and Balkan countries, but in those countries in which all of the soil seems to be occupied there still remains to be performed an enormous task of exploitation. The whole of the south of Europe (Italy, Spain, Portugal, France south of the Loire, and the shores of the Adriatic) must be given fresh value by the exploitation of hydro-electric energy, which will bring with it the creation of industries hitherto unknown in these regions, and a complete transformation of town and country.

Agriculture is passing through a revolution all over Europe. The towns largely want rebuilding.

In a word, Europe has to pass from one economic stage on to the next. That will provide her with work for half a century. But only if she learns to adopt a system of remuneration of labour under which, at every upward movement of production, distribution is made equitably among all classes of producers.

A general, connected plan will be needed, with estimates of yield and a programme of production within fixed periods. At present, only the United States and Soviet Russia have organized economic planning of this sort. The United States have only a very incomplete plan, rather the plan of a few organizations than one of the state. In the U.S.S.R. there is a special

institution which elaborates a state plan. It was responsible for the Five-year Plan, and it takes account of the whole economic system of the federated republics, fixes the tasks to be achieved and spreads them over the whole Union. The idea is grandiose, and it is calculated to assure steady technical progress, free from the crises which are the bugbear of production in other countries. But the way in which it has been carried out is very questionable: the state plan is elaborated by Moscow specialists, in Moscow, and is then passed on to the various republics and territories, and so to their works, whose comments and criticism are invited.

There has begun to be introduced in France, for public services carried on by private enterprises, a different system which I propose here. If a state plan is to be elaborated, it is worked out piecemeal to begin with by the special organs concerned in each region or district. Virtually, this means that the organs of the state lay down the broad lines of a plan of working and leave it to the regional organs to fill in the details. The regional organs will make an inventory of all their unexploited resources, and draw up a programme of production and consumption for a fixed number of years ahead, a programme of new enterprises, and one of local finance. Regional offices will make a first effort at adjust-

ment, and the final adjustment for the whole country will be made by the national planning office. It will thus be possible to organize a scientific forecast of excess or deficient production, calculated in goods and not in money, and so to direct production, to restrict it or extend as required, and avoid gluts of unwanted products. The method can be extended to a group of states. It is easy to conceive a continental bureau of coordination and adjustment.

There is no difficulty in conceiving the plan or the method. But it must not be pretended that it will be easy to put it into practice. Its data will be supplied with a certain caprice, coming from capitalist industry or from the cooperatives or the trade unions. It will take time to develop a system which gets close to realities. But it is well to observe that the Five-year Plan is giving extremely interesting results in Soviet Russia, although the U.S.S.R. has as yet a very inadequately staffed administrative apparatus, and although the Soviet method is based on centralization instead of the much better method of decentralization here proposed.

Such are the general directives and methods which we propose for Europe. The first essential is that Europe shall base her progress in the world of the future on her own soil. In no other way can she emerge from the momentous crisis

which would come the moment she had to abandon the imperialism which has permitted her to take possession of part of the substance of Asia. It is, indeed, a crisis which is coming in any case, a crisis which has already begun, with events in India which will inevitably end in India's economic independence. Asia is a continent which will cease to be a part of the European economic system, whether Europe likes it or not. And if we voluntarily abandon the imperialist system, we shall have to envisage a complete reversal of our economic relations with Asia. Exchange will not come to an end; but what will be ended is the system which placed at the disposal of Europe the dividends from the exploitation of Asia.

For the new Europe there will be a new task, the creation of an economic system based on raw materials hitherto unexploited; a system which will transform her internal economy and will give an immediate objective for European collaboration. Europe will find at her gate a whole continent for exploitation.

Africa is at the very outset of a development which in twenty years' time will amaze Europe. It is difficult to understand Europe's military-mad condition when one thinks of the immense field of collaboration offered to the European peoples by Africa. There is work in Africa for

all the peoples who inhabit her, for all Europe, and for uncounted millions yet unborn, who could live in that astonishing continent once it is opened up. Ten millions of men died in Europe between 1914 and 1918 because the three imperialisms of Britain, France, and Germany were contesting markets in Asia and Africa for the sale of a few tons of cotton piece goods, when there lay open to them in the African continent, if they could collaborate, a field in which all Europe can find work for half a century with ease.

The war system is indeed a rare absurdity. Britain made immense sacrifices, largely in order to make Germany clear out of her positions in Africa. All the German colonies in Africa were shared out among the victors; which amounted to sacrificing a goose for an egg, and no golden one at that. For a Europe who wastes her substance in preparations for war is in no condition to expend the necessary energy on the exploitation of Africa. If these calculations had been made in 1914, the idea would probably have emerged which I am going to put forward—

To make of all Africa the great common workshop of Europe in the twentieth century, and to seek there practical solutions of the problems of interracial collaboration.

Europe does not yet know the countless

potentialities of Africa, where immense tracts are still waiting to be populated, but no population is possible until Europe has made roads, supplied motor vehicles, built some great railways, and regulated water-courses—the whole on a plan drawn up for all Africa. The traveller is amazed when he sees the immense opportunities of work that all this represents for Europe. He realizes that nothing will be possible if the peoples of Europe merely fight, while enormous wealth will come out of the African soil if all Europe lends its energies to its exploitation.

Exceptional conditions permit this development through interracial collaboration. At all the coastal points of penetration there is installed an active, intelligent, honest race, the Arabs. Strong nuclei of Hindus provide men prepared for the organization of exchange, and peoples of the black race constitute, from north to south, a healthy human reserve of high quality. It is true that this humanity is sometimes, indeed often, elementary; but did not the Gauls and the Teutons of Cæsar's time belong to an elementary humanity? Up to now Europe has "civilized" Africa by submitting all her peoples to a double yoke—her own and that of aristocratic fighting minorities who have been associated in the benefits of civilization. That system must be entirely changed. A new Africa must be created

on the lines of a federation of republics to which only the non-bellicist peoples will be admitted, and which, in collaboration with a united Europe, would be able to develop a complete plan of development of the African continent.

I propose a complete reversal of the so-called colonial system. I know that my proposals, though I am putting them forward quite dispassionately, will horrify some of my compatriots, even among the Socialists—compatriots whose only conception of the relations between Europe and Africa is that of shooters and shot. I tell these people very gently that all that has got to be changed, and we have all got to get out of the absurd notion that a man of colour cannot be on the same level of civilization as we ourselves.

Once more, the choice must be made: does Europe want to go on fighting in order that three or four of her Great Powers may dispute between themselves markets which they will not be able to exploit, surely the most stupid course imaginable; or does she want to put the peoples of Africa in a position to make rapid progress and to accept her financial assistance and that of her technical experts during all the long period necessary for the creation of an educated directing class in Africa?

This latter policy is the sanest and the most

profitable open to us. Europe can scarcely people Africa outside the territories that she has already peopled. All she can send into the tropical regions is her technical and organizing class. If she wishes to find great markets in Africa, she will only find them by herself doing all she can to further the increase of the black population and its rapid evolution. And this will only be possible through an entirely new system of relations between the races. If we suppress the gun between Whites, we must suppress it between the Whites and the men of colour. Believe me, I am not imagining that the suppression will suddenly turn into peaceful and harmless citizens certain coloured brutes, whose brutality, for all that, is no greater than that of certain White brutes. But these brutes, who remain in savagery and barbarism, and whom our weakness delivered up to the life of the brute beasts, would call for the special measures of security indicated already when we were considering the struggle against the White warmongers. In Africa, as in Europe, there will have to be organized a service of international hygiene to bring back to work those tribes, peoples, or groups who may think of escaping from labour through war.

The practical task would be the organization of a great African federation, perhaps with three great divisions—Northern, Equatorial, and

Southern Africa—in which the Egyptians, Abyssinians, Moroccans, Algerians, and Tunisians, together with the South African republics, would represent the advance guard of civilization. They would cooperate with a European economic conference whose mission would be to supply the finance and the technical direction for the exploitation of Africa, interest and amortization of the cost of installations being payable in African products. The first task of this organization would be the elaboration of a general plan, spread over ten years, which would enable to be done in that period what otherwise would take thirty years. It need hardly be said that the new system would place all the European republics on the same footing, and that they would be called on to supply technical experts and administrative advisers in proportion to their capacity to do so, and without taking any account of the results of war. That presupposes the making of Europe. Once more, however, either we shall succeed in the making of Europe, or we shall go to ruin. Throughout I am discussing our problem on the hypothesis of the ascent of man, and I am rejecting the hypothesis of death.

It will be clear to everyone that the financing of the exploitation of Africa means simply the supplying to all Africa, in five years instead of twenty, of the greatest possible quantity of

locomotives, rails, motor vehicles, agricultural machines, tractors, and machinery of all sorts, a supply financed in Europe partly by the states themselves and partly by producers. It is easy to see that an operation on such a scale would give an enormous impulse to European and, indeed, to world production. It would be the beginning of the rational organization of the world, which, of course, is the object to be aimed at.

VI

I can well imagine that more than one reader will charge me with letting my imagination run wild, with trying to build Rome in a day, with trying to hustle all humanity. It will certainly be objected that my plans are too audacious, are chimerical, are unrealizable. Not a few will say that in things of this sort one must go slowly and with wise moderation. That is what one hears in the League of Nations, where the august personages who give the signal for a move seem to have all the slowness and wise moderation of tortoises. They might charge us with wanting to get ahead with the speed of hares. We will remind them that we did so, as combatants, through mud and blood—through their fault. For the war of 1914-1918, that European massacre, came upon us through their

wisdom and moderation and caution. In 1914 they thought it would be clever to bluff with war; they thought, quite sincerely, that their little paper barriers were going to hold up all the straining militarisms. The war came to waken them out of their torpor. We paid a terrible price for these gentlemen's caution and moderation and wisdom. We are entitled to declare that we have no respect for these timidities. Those people are asleep and dreaming. We are awake and working. Our task is to make impossible the war towards which these dreamers are leading us yet again. We do not want their war. We will not wage it. Our task is to discover all the means of achieving peace. It is an immense task. We shall not carry it through with anæmic academic proposals, but only with sturdy revolutionary proposals, made by producers used to daily work and to the direction of factories and transport and agriculture.

Our task is to put before you the means which can achieve peace, the true means which can achieve it to-day and to-morrow, and not in the year 2000. I have said that it means a revolution. If you are unprepared to go so far, resign yourself to being sent to rot in the marshes of Saint-Gond, while all your politicians, with their caution and moderation and wisdom, go to Bordeaux or Biarritz to enjoy life, and while the

munition firms grow rich on the sweat of the brows of your womenfolk, mobilized under the Paul-Boncour law.

We do not intend to wait until the last moment before taking steps to prevent that; our task is to get to work to-day. And getting to work does not mean publishing manifestos filled with fine thoughts; it means organization—work according to a plan, with a precise objective; it means action.

I agree that this involves some risk for those who undertake this action; but, after all, it means much less risk than that of a wretched patrol fifty paces from the enemy lines; less risk than a sleep cut short by the visit of a couple of hundred bombing planes above Paris or Berlin.

What is it that you want—peace or war? If you want peace, take the steps that it demands—political revolution, cultural revolution, economic revolution, international revolution. No peace is possible with the existing national separations. We must go to work at once for the effective creation, to begin with, of European federation, as a first step towards world federation, the federation into which all peoples will enter freely as equals, either with equal pride or with equal repentance.

You know well that you will not achieve peace so long as you maintain a moral situation

which sets up two categories of peoples, innocent and blameworthy. The people who made the Treaty of Versailles were mad. They did all they could to put into the hearts of the Germans and Austrians and Hungarians the thought of revenge and release from a humiliation. A true peace cannot be made with a people when it is made to declare itself guilty of a war which was the outcome of a system in which all states, all nations were involved. There will be no peace in Europe so long as the Treaty of Versailles lasts. It is the generator of wars and has multiplied the risks of war in Europe.

Yet I do not say revise the treaties. The revision of treaties between sovereign powers is bound to bring war. The treaties have not to be revised but annulled, by remaking Europe on fresh foundations. Europe must be a union of equal republics associated in labour, each free to use its own language, and all taking upon themselves an equal share of the burden left by the war of 1914-1918. If we do not remake Europe on this plane, we shall be precipitated into war.

VII

I believe in peace because I know the deep feeling of peoples. I have been through war, and for a considerable period in the obscurity of the

rank and file. I have lived intimately with the common people, who are the raw material of battles. There were not five men in a thousand who wanted the war. Be assured that it was the same on every front. If, in these conditions, millions of men went into the war, it was because they were absolutely at a loss. On all sides the leaders had given way—Christians and Socialists alike. The bishops and pontiffs of Socialism preached war. What could the flock do? They went to the shambles. And then, in France, millions of republicans and Socialists had an obscure feeling that a victory of the Kaiser's would be a victory for militarism. It is no longer a question that need be discussed, but the fact is a part of the past.

As for the future, which we have to make, we shall no longer have the right to evade the issue. If to-day we say that war is evil, we shall have in future to say it at all times. From now on we must speak out our thought unreservedly, without nuances, without reticences. There can be no shuffling with war; one must say Yes or No. We say No, and we say why. The masses who listen to us must know that men well situated for observing and foreseeing and judging are speaking plainly, and are against war absolutely.

Then, with the will, will come the confidence—and action. We shall enter the period of the

actual building up of peace. We shall be taking our first steps in the new world.

* * *

I can hear my reader. I know the question which he is putting to himself, the final one. In this world of peace, what will be man's spur to activity? Was not war the most powerful of all dynamic forces for humanity—the means of selection of individuals and of peoples? Was it not the creator of energy, brought into play by the most powerful act that a human being can accomplish, the surmounting of the fear of death? Is not peace an abandonment to pusillanimity, the utter downfall of humanity?

Our Quinton is the last writer who has ventured to take up once more these old arguments of the bellicists. I have said already that in his *Maximes de la Guerre* Quinton, an upright man, a noble soul, a fine fighter, merely analysed his own virtues. If he had applied to the study of war the scientific methods which he applied to the study of biological phenomena, he would have seen that what is true for the animal is not true at all for man. Selection through war works for the animals, who bring their own brute force into play. It does not work at all for man, whose progress is assured by his intelligence. The developed man, the intelligent man,

is much less physically strong than the primitive brute. This is reversed selection. With arms, it is intelligence that triumphs. But in that case it is not what are called the military virtues, it is no longer the heroisms that excite Quinton's admiration, that come into play. If a civilized man kills a primitive brute with a revolver, it is not by any means a triumph for heroism. There has been no selection by war, only by intelligence.

And in modern war there is no question of upward-working selection. It is the courageous man who is eliminated, and the timid, the cowardly, the pusillanimous who get well to the rear. Wars are now means of reversed selection for peoples.

Shall we speak of war as keeping people fit, preventing them from sinking into a life of pleasure, preventing the world from being delivered over to the worship of money? Let us agree that, if without the spur of war peoples would abandon themselves to the pursuit of money, we should be reduced to considerable pessimism in regard to the future of humanity. We know one people under the influence of money—the United States: already it shows such signs of moral decadence that those who most admire its technical efficiency consider that it may rapidly succumb to the evils which are gnawing at it. King Money is, indeed, for a

people the search for pleasure and enjoyment, not through work, but by all the means offered by immorality, from debauch to murder. The organized bands of thieves who ravage the American cities with impunity are the product of a civilization of which the motive force is the pursuit of money.

The argument is inapplicable to a society in which the possession of money confers no right, not even that of eating. If you cannot eat unless you are a worker, and have your identity card as a producer, a producer at work and in an organization, you avert the plague of this new parasitism produced by the United States. You reduce the possibilities of fraud so greatly that they may be regarded as no longer existing.

I conclude that a civilization founded on labour—that is, on the rights of the producer—will be an active, healthy, strong civilization, made moral by its legal basis. All the considerations advanced in favour of war as an elevating element, and against peace as a demoralizing one, have been advanced by writers unaccustomed to productive labour.

Anyone who has worked, really worked, in field or factory or office, knows the elevating influence of work. I am not speaking of the value of work as regards purity of morals. There are certainly fewer opportunities of debauchery

in a progressive workshop than in certain drawing-rooms, and in general proletarian sexual morality is decidedly superior to that of society. And the more skilled the worker, the better his morality from this point of view—not because he is better but because his work leaves him no leisure for the refined debauchery of the richer classes. In this way, work is in certain respects a moralizing influence. But it is not on this aspect of morality that I want to conclude. I only want to point out that while a man of the world can live a life of debauchery without losing his situation or his social rank, a worker cannot do so without losing his rank as a worker, since work is impossible amid a continuous debauch. For the rest, man is human and weak in the face of temptation, in the workshop just as anywhere else. But work prevents him from making of it a system of life.

My main concern, however, is to point out that so far as general morality goes—that is, in developing in man the taste for life, the aptitude for action, and an ardour in the cause of progress—work is a hundred times superior to war. If the preparation for war was an influence in man working against decadence, labour is a much stronger influence, for it is man's defence against death in the form of the famine which is always at the gates of our cities.

Society writers do not know the value of this influence. All the producers know it. They are in contact with it in the forms of unemployment or bankruptcy, which are unceasingly bringing hunger to their notice and letting their imagination dwell on famine.

* * *

A civilization founded on labour is the end of war.

I do not say that it is near at hand, that we shall see it at to-morrow's dawn. Its completion is still far from us. There will still be great tragedies in the world before the flag of peace and labour waves above every capital of the world. But some of it we are experiencing already. It is in us. It inspires us. It is our reason for living. We have the feeling, almost the certainty that we can give it to Europe in the course of our lives—that if some conflagration still comes in the world it will not be in the European domain. Europe, it seems to us, will be created in the years that we shall live. That is my belief. And I think that for us it is a question of will and of the choice of means. If there are many risks of war in Europe, there are marvellous chances for peace. It is for us to take them. It is for us to gather together those who,

in war, saw peace born and nursed their will to create the world of peace.

We shall enter in this life into this new world, into this world in which labour will be the basis of all law. We shall do so with our mysticism which gives us the knowledge that the greatness of man can come only from labour; and that labour, leading man from progress to progress and up to the highest liberation that he can know, will permit him one day to decipher the enigma of being and moving.



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: WYNARD SQUARE
AUCKLAND, N.Z.: 41 ALBERT STREET
TORONTO: 91 WELLINGTON STREET, WEST

The Revolt of the Masses

by JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET

Demy 8vo. With a Biographical Note by the Translator 8s. 6

The author of this book is Professor of Philosophy at the University Madrid, editor of the *Revista de Occidente* and one of the intellectual leaders of the new Republic in Spain. This book is a study of the revolt of the unqualified mass, of whatever social order, against the authority of the select minority in every sphere of human activity.

Poverty in Plenty

The Ethics of Income

by J. A. HOBSON

Cr. 8vo 2s. 6

"Mr. Hobson has written a masterly book, cognate, right-minded, reasonable and clear. It deserves a very wide circulation."—*Listener*
"I urge my readers to buy it. I have, in common with everyone who knows him and his work, immense respect for Mr. Hobson, and am considerably influenced by his economic doctrines."—ST. JOHN ERVIN in *Time and Tide*

The Problem of Unemployment

by PAUL H. DOUGLAS and AARON DIRECTOR

Demy 8vo 17s

"A thorough survey of the general field, comparable in scope with William Beveridge's standard work."—*New Statesman*

The Riddle of Rationalisation

by L. J. BARLEY, D.S.O., M.A. (Oxon.), B.Sc. (Lond.),
with a Foreword by SIR JOSIAH STAMP, G.B.E.

Cr. 8vo. 4s.

Scientific achievement would allow the standard of living of we and of profit to be increased by fifty per cent. The author outlines a *National Plan* to attain this by the scientific reorganization of British industry, and after discussing the present crisis sets out the advantage to British and international trade of its successful accomplishment.

All prices are net

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD